

創価大学
国際仏教学高等研究所
年 報

平成29年度
(第21号)

Annual Report
of
The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
at Soka University
for the Academic Year 2017
Volume XXI

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所
東京・2018・八王子

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
Soka University
Tokyo・2018

The Tocharian *Araṇemi-Jātaka**

Tatsushi TAMAI

On the present topic, there is already a transcription of the *Araṇemi-Jātaka* in A-Toch. by E. Sieg and W. Siegling (1921) translated by E. Sieg (Thomas 1952), and a transcription for B-Toch. by Sieg and Siegling (Thomas 1953) translated by K.T. Schmidt (2001) who was my teacher in Saarbrücken and unfortunately deceased on February 7th 2017. I would like to dedicate this article to Dr. Klaus Totila Schmidt.

Other than Tocharian, we can find the name "Aranemi" in Sanskrit and Pāli¹, Sogdian², Tumshuqese³, Chinese⁴, Uighur⁵ and Tibetan⁶. This might mean that the *Araṇemi-Jātaka* was popular not only in Northern Silk Road⁷ but also other areas, even though the contents differ from Tocharian.

The Jātaka originally keeps three parts (*paccuppannavatthu*, *atītavatthu* and *samodhāna*), but Avadāna only shows the main story. Our *Araṇemi-Jātaka* keeps the last one *samodhāna*, though it is not complete.

The texts under consideration are written in both A- and B-Tocharian languages found in fragments in Šorčuq and Qizil. The abbreviations after THT (Tocharische Handschriften aus Turfan) are as follows: <T> means "Turfan Expedition", <II> "the second", <III> "the third", <Š> "Šorčuq", Numbers such as <101.18> signify the original numbers used in Berlin after the texts were brought from Central Asia.

I will begin this study with my transliteration of the Tocharian text (in italics). When a document is unavailable (i.e. it does not exist in THT), or when missing *akṣaras* are unclear to me, I refer to the transcriptions published by Sieg/Siegling. I then give my tentative translation, in which I sometimes use awkward English to remain faithful to the Tocharian grammar, followed by my commentary in the footnotes.

* I would like to express my thanks to those who corrected my English, to Prof. Zieme for preparing PDF of Silk Road Studies (SRS) V which contains important studies for *Araṇemi-Jātaka*, to Prof. Karashima for pointing me to former researches, to Prof. Saito for some information about Toch. grammar, and to the SAT Daizōkyō (abbreviated as T.) Text Database, from which I quoted the Chinese texts. Needless to say, for any remaining errors and inaccuracies I alone am to blame.

¹ Karashima et al. 2015, p. 169; *Aṅguttara-Nikāya* IV pp. 136–139 (*Araka*).

² Sundermann in SRS V, p. 339–348.

³ Bailey 1968, p. 44; Emmerick 1979, p. 172.

⁴ Narimatu 成松芳子 1975, p. 262; 阿離念彌經, 阿蘭那經.

⁵ Hamilton 1986, pp. 1–20; Zieme in SRS V, pp. 401–433.

⁶ Panglung 1981, p. 49; Yao 2013 pp. 429–431.

⁷ Yoshida 1993, p. 135, 207 p. 59.

I. Transliteration and Translation of A-Tocharian with Commentaries

THT 0978r (T III Š63.8; *Araṇemi-Jātaka* 1; ≈THT 0077)

1 /// R(.) .. R(.) + + .. + + + + +

2 /// • *sūccāc*ː • *paśi mācaR* l. [l]. .ts.

3 /// .. *luṣrācā*⁸ *tāk[m]äS* || *tāPArK* *PALtSAṃ(kāṣ?)*

4 /// *ne SAM* *puttišparna[cː]* *skey(aṃ?)* [y] *āṃ(tRA?)*

5 /// (*sā*) [*s*] *lu(m)T* *PALtSAkyo* *PAklyoṢAS* *caM* *cāt(a)[k]s(ṣe maSAK)*⁹

<translation>

1 /// nothing to translate.

2 /// ... *Sūccāc*, *Paśi*, the mother ... (personal name?)

3 /// ... || Now he/she thinks

4 /// ... he would make(?) effort for Buddha-worth.

5 /// with attention(← jumped thought) hear the *Jātaka*'s affair(←connection)!

0978v

1 /// *msec*ː¹⁰ *wu toṣitṣä(←i)ñi ñäktāñä(←ñː)* *jñānapra(bha)*

2 /// [*RA*] *Ṣ* *karuṇaprabhe ñKäT* *tRAñ[KA](Ṣ)* + +

3 /// *ñkāraṃ* (4x18) || *ñäktāñː* (*s*) *ku(nt)w(äṢ)* *litantRA ñareṣ(i)-*

4 (*ñi klopantyo*) /// .. *ntRA kaṢT* *yokeyo* : *napeñi ṣme*

5 (*ṢArmeyo?*) /// *ñcː* [*ṣ*] *ome t(a)t[m](u)Ṣ* *w(ra)ṃ saṃ* .. + +

<translation>

1 /// two gods of *Tuṣita* (come or greet?), *Jñānaprabha* (and *Karuṇaprabha*)

2 /// having ... the god *Karuṇaprabha* says

3 /// in the metre of ... *ñkāra* || The gods fall down from happiness, (with unhappiness?) of hell (pl. in Toch.)

4 /// with hunger and thirst they ... : People ... rain-seasons

5 /// some (are) born in water ...

THT 0977r (T III Š92.46; *Araṇemi-Jātaka* 2; ≈THT0078)

1 + .. + + *nāṢ* l. + + + *wäL* *tRAñKAṢ* *kucː* *ypaM* /// (*k_iya*)-

2 *L* (*pa*) *t ñi enaṣlune mā (kaś to)RAṢA eL* *essik atSA sRAñkā(T)* ///

3 ... *naṢ* *āLA(ṣtā)OR(.) eL* *elūneyä[Ṣ]* .. ///

⁸ This word is difficult not only to divide, but also to understand its meaning. If *tāk[m]äS* matches with B-Toch. THT 077r1,2 *tākaM*, "we would be", it could be *ārwer* "ready" (r1) or *sp(aktanīki)* "servant". If *prācū* (not *prācː*, as is in Sieg/Siegling 1921 p. 190) is a scribal error for *pratim* "decision", semantically *ārwer* "ready" is better, though still unclear. Apropos of *tākmäs*, it is not subj. V, as is in TEB II p. 10. Presumably the subj. stem should be changed (or corrupted), i.e. B-Toch. /tākā/ → A-Toch. /tāk/ because of apocope, even though the suffix /-ā-/ is an important characteristic for subj. V. If this is acceptable, A-Toch. is developed from B-Toch., it is not an original dialect, and the verbal system in A-Toch. should be changed, e.g. there exists no *sk*-pres. in A-Toch. (class IX in B-Toch.).

⁹ Cf. THT 077r4 *sasāllaṣ palsko(sa)* ... 77r5 *cau jāta(KAṣṣe me)ske*.

¹⁰ Sieg amended this word as (*ku*)*mse(m)cː* "they come", but I think that it could be just a scribal error for (*ku*)*mseñcː* (or (*NA*)*mseñcː*), as is in line 5 below. *ä* → *u* in *kumseñc* and its impv. *pukmäs* is a facility of the pronunciation, not a dialectal or a phonological difference.

4 *ākāL SAM**, *k_upre(ne nu caṢAK, c)m(o)laṃ nātswatsi klintaR, ñi [e](L.)* /// (*plācām*)

5 (*to*)*SAM, mā esaM, tRAñksī* : *I¹¹(←•) || SA(←RA)sKAR, aru puruhi[T], tRAñ(KAṢ.)* ///

<translation>

1 ... the king says "What do I make? ///

2 Or why do you leave(←not consider) my order (and) get excited even to give a gift? ///

3 ... is ... , you keep away from giving a gift ... ///

4 ... the wish. If he¹² then must starve in even this world(←birth), my (gift) ...

5 I do not want(←give) to tell the(se speeches). || Excited(←called) violently the sage(←*Purohita*) says ///

0977v

1 .. [*ṣ*]*ñi ākāliss mosaṃ ypeye(←i)S, tālorñe mā ṣke(←am) ka(ś toRAṢ.)* /// (*ca*-

2 *M() weñlune(yāṢ.)* + + + .. *mā āluRAṢ, lānTA¹³ erk[at](une)* ///

3 ... *brāmnac*ː, (*t*)*RAOñkiñc*ː, *hai brahma¹⁴ [ñ]*. ///

4 .. (*o*)*MAṣem wraso[M], (mā tu) [cā]mPAT, elam wañiyuM*, nā(TAK.)¹⁵* ///

5 .. *mā (te) ci karya[ṣ]¹⁶ (s)ā(S, aru)ñāvati ri • tu enāK, wraso(M.)* ///

<translation>

1 for the sake of his own wish, not having taken care of the misery of the country ...

2 from (this) speech(←saying) ... not having restrained ... (an)ger of the king ...

3 they speak to the Brahmin: "Pooh, oh Brahmin! ...

4 (you) can(not) be a angry person (who is) fond of(←in) a gift, oh Sir! ///

5 (whether) Aruṇavati town not ... you? • You are a mean(er) person. ///

THT 0976r (T III Š80.13; *Araṇemi-Jātaka* 3; ≈THT 079; no photo)

1 + + + + + ¹⁷(*TMAṢ, wä*)*L, ts(em yokāṢ, a)ś(ä)nyo āmāsāsac*ː, *PAlkoRAṢ, tRAñKAṢ,*

¹¹ This is not a number but a punctuation before double *daṇḍa* ||.

¹² /sām/ is a demonstrative pronoun nom.sg.m. "this, he (Skt. *saḥ*)". Sieg translates this passage as "[ist] der Wunsch, wenn ich (auch schon) in (dieser) Geburt verhungern müßte" (Sieg 1952 p. 35) but /sām/ stands never after the noun "der Wunsch", and the predicate is not 1.sg. /klinmār/ but *klintaR*, which could be a scribal error for 3.sg. *klinTAR*. The speaker is the king, and "he" is a person who is in distress.

¹³ The *virāma* sign is lacking (cf. Sieg/Siegling 1921 p. 189 fn. 7, but it is possible that /ä/ is a phonetically murmured sound and sometimes treated as soundless. Another possibility is *metri causa*, if the passage is in verse.

¹⁴ From the context, *brahma* should be voc. which is not surely attested. When there is no special form for voc., it is supplemented with nom. so it could be *brahmaṃ* (apocope of Skt. *brāhmaṇa*?), which is not attested. After *brahma*, the rest of *ñ*. can be recognized, then it could be *brahmañāKAT*, which is written *passim*. In the beginning of this line, we can see *brāmnac* (all. of *brām*), which is a tocharized form, but *brahmañāKAT*, could be a courteous form (close to Skt. and respectful Toch., cf. Bernhard 1958 p. 18 *prattika-ptāñKAT*), which is suitable here. Apropos A-Toch. /ñäkt/ (apocope from B-Toch. /ñäkte/) is *communis opinio* "god, Skt. deva; Chin. 天", but it is possible that /ñäkt/ is an agglutinative suffix expressing pliteness towards senior, e.g. *ptāñKAT* is /pät/ (←Skt. Buddha) & /ñäkt/ = "(honorable) Buddha" (Toch. -ā could be Skt. -a of Buddha).

¹⁵ This is a complement of Sieg (1952 p. 35, fn. 15) as the subject of the sentence in nom. sg., but if the complement is right, I regard it as a voc. as is in THT 976r5 because of the word order and context.

¹⁶ Sieg takes this word as pres.3.sg. of √kary- "to laugh", but this verb belongs to pres. III /karyeṣ/. I would read it as *karyap.ā*, as is in Poucha p. 54, which is independent from √kary-.

¹⁷ The Uighur version (Hamilton I, 1986 p. 10 line 44–46) corresponds to line 1–2: "À ce moment-là, le roi Araṇemi, tournant (vers eux) ses beaux yeux doux, «..... Maintenant ce brahmane est assis à la place de mon maître. Il faut écouter attentivement les rudes paroles propres à celui-ci.»".

maR, MAntā(cārñi)

2 + + + + + + + + + + mā te tam¹⁸ ñi şmo TAmo TAm ñi KALŞAL, caŞAŞ, enişluneşim
erkātune ||

3 [t]MAŞ, (āmāsā)ñ(,) KAlıcam¹⁹ kāresyo tānaşoliS, yokmañc²⁰ şmoRAŞ, śla wāktasurñe
lānta-

4 c(,) tRAnk(iñc) || phull(enam) 4x14 || ²¹lā(m)tuneşim kra(nT) tiryā āriñc, waSAñ entsāte :
kāswoneyiS, śmoññe naŞT,

5 [m]ā + + k. yārka yā(←ya)[L]²² (:) mā śkañ nāTAK, waS, [c]āmplye tñ(,) erkātune caŞ(,)
KLAssi : oñi cmolşı rākşa[tS,] (SAM,)

<translation>

1 ... (then the ki)ng, having seen the ministers with eyes (of) blue (colour), says, "Do not
scold(←hurt) (him)!

2 ... Do I not just stand (in such a case)? Just because of it, I must endure the anger of order
by(←from) him. ||

3 Then the ministers, (having) stood at the gate of *Dānaśālā*(= alms-giving site) with swords (laid
together?), say to the king with homage.

4 || in the metre of *phullen* (4x14) || By the good manner of the kingship, you have grabbed our
heart. : You are the site of the virtue.

5 (You are) incomparable to be honored. : And, oh Lord! we can not bear this anger of you. : The
Rākşasa in(← of) human shape(← birth)

0976v

1 kalkāŞ, lo ymāR, c[a]Ş, ypey[ä]Ş, : • || klopasū nāntsu wāL, tRAnKAS, pācri [p]uK(,) w. .āñ(,) ,
m. + +²³

¹⁸ tam is unclear. Sieg regards it as "auch" (1952 p. 36). The manuscript itself is lost, so I cannot ensure the reading. If it is a scribal error for TAm as it is in the same line, it means "just", but this assumption is dubious. Tentatively, I take "just". Against Sieg, I see ñi şmo the same as ñi KALŞAL, for "gen. subject" with "part.", i.e. "I stood", which Sieg translates as "er(←Purohita) stand". A participle (or verbal adj.) became a noun (*Nominalisierung*), to which belongs a gen. functioning as a doer.

¹⁹ KAlıcam is *hapax legomenon*, and the meaning is unknown. Sieg translated it as "drohenden (?)", and the same in TEB II p. 94 with "wohl zu kälts- ("bedrohen")", but ts → c never occurred and presumably it is *ad hoc*. A scribal error is not impossible, e.g. *kalyāñ* (Skt. *kalyāṇa*) "noble". In B-Toch. THT 079, 2 *kertem onkor MALKānte* "they fold swords", in which *onkor* means "together" in B-Toch.. I would like to take this "together".

²⁰ *yokmañc* stands in Sieg/Siegling 1921 p. 189, but in TEB II p. 77 *yokm añc*(←*añc* Postpos. c. Obl. "zu, an"). There is no postposition *añc*, and *añc* is found here and in THT 806v3 *sañkrāmañc* only. I see another possibility, viz. a scribal error for loc. -am or a mixture of loc. and all. -ac. I prefer loc. because of /şmoras/ "having stood". Moreover, ñc → mc is normally impossible because of palatal c. Instead, mc → ñc is a normal sound change and ñ → m could occur in absentia of c.

²¹ The Uighur version (Hamilton I, 1986 p. 10 line 52–58) corresponds to line 4–5: "«Monseigneur, votre belle prestance, votre doux langage, et votre cœur tendre, plein de bonnes actions, ont entièrement subjugué les consciences de nos entrailles, de nos cœurs, etc. Nous n'avons pas pu outrepasser l'ordre de Monseigneur. Cela étant, que ce brahmane à l'apparence laide, à la mine de démon, et aux mauvaises actions s'en aille, ne reste pas dans nos campagnes ou dans nos villes.»".

²² Sieg translated this passage as "(Es gibt(?)) keinen, der mehr(?) zu verehren ist". I would supplement the lacuna with *mā ālyeksā* (cf. THT 702r3) and offer my translation: "not through others (= the best of all, incomparable) he must be honored" if Sieg's correction of *yāl* → *yal* is correct. Anyway, I would like to see and check the manuscript itself.

²³ If the number of lost *akşaras* is correct, I read this passage tentatively as follows: *pācri [p]uK(,) w(ütty)āñ(,) m(anikaLAŞ,) ñātsey[ä]Ş,] pāşlye.*

- 2 *ñātsey[äṣ] pāṣhye MA[nT] wāTKAśś²⁴ [ñ]i ṣñi KAṣṣim ypeyāṣ, tSAknātsi āmāsāñ²⁵, tRAnkiñc, mā[t]e²⁵ nāTAK,*
- 3 *caṃ [b]rā(maṃ) e(pe) mā te waṣ, entsatRA was nū taṃne wKAṇṇyo nātkiṣ, yāsluntaśśāL, mā cāmplye*
- 4 + s. + + + + + || *mnū luTAsmāṇ wāL, tRAnKAṣ, hai ṣokyo nu oklopac²⁶, kakmu nasaM, kuc²⁷,*
- 5 + + + + + + + r *TMAṣ, (āmāsāñ²⁸) lāntaṣ²⁶ ke KAlpoṣ, kāresā sāseyūṣ, śālyiṣ, po(saṃ)²⁷*
- <translation>
- 1 should go away from this country immediately. : • || The king, feeling(←been) sad, says, "All fathers are umbrellas(?)
- 2 (which) should guard from defect (and) distress. Why do you decide to pull out my own teacher from the country? Ministers say: The Lord would
- 3 take(←grab) whether this Brahmin or us, (in any case) now we cannot (endure to be?) together with enemies of lord in such a manner.
- 4 ... out of (←removing) the sense, the king says, "Oh dear, now I came across exceedingly (big) danger. How
- 5 ... Then (ministers), having gained permission from the king, supported (themselves) with swords, (wall) of hall ...

II. Transliteration and Translation of B-Tocharian with Commentaries

From a paleographical point of view, our *Araṇemi-Jātaka* (THT 077–106) shows the same form and style of handwriting as THT 071–076 whose content is *Buddhastotra*²⁸. I will begin from THT 077, which shows the conversation between two gods, *Jñānasthite* and *Guṇasaṃpade* (in A-Toch.: *Jñānaprabhe* and *Karuṇaprabhe*, THT 978v1–2; both Toch. in nom. sg. -e²⁹).

The folios are written sometimes on recto only. Judging from the case of THT 078, I suppose that they were originally written on both sides. This folio THT 078 is a jumble of some pieces (on the photo we can see two numbers, T III Š93 and Š67), and recto is complete, but some of the versos are not written (only one piece is written on verso). Presumably the ink washed out or the

²⁴ *wāTKAśś* is, after Sieg (1952 p. 36 "ihr befiehlt mir") and TEB II p. 140, pres. caus. 2. pl., but -śś ← -śc from -s(caus.)-c(2.pl.) is irregular because -c is an important characteristic for 2. pl. and double consonants stand only before and after vowels (not medially, but in the beginning or end of words). In B-Toch. *wāTKAścer-ñ* (THT 079r4) is a corresponding. Presumably the writer of A-Toch. could not understand the importance of 2. pl. -c and made an assimilation from B-Toch. -śc.

²⁵ *mā te ... mā te* is added to B-Toch. version and functions as *epe ... epe* "whether ... or", though *epe* is written. This also means that A-Toch. was written on the ground of B-Toch.

²⁶ If this word is abl. of /wāl/ "king", it is a scribal error for *lānTAs* (or a misreading?).

²⁷ *po(saṃ)* is a guess by Sieg (1952 p. 36 fn. 18), but the meaning of "below" is not suitable. I suppose *po(ṣi)* "wall" which can go with *śālyiṣ* "of the hall", but of course the context is unclear because of absence of the next folio.

²⁸ Cf. Ji 季羨林 2010 vol. 16, p. 177: No. 71–76 是一首 *Buddhastotra*, No. 77–98 才是 *Araṇemi-Jātaka*, No. 99–103 *Subhāṣitagaveṣur*(←*Subhāṣitagaveṣin*?)的故事。These folios are written by the same writer because of the paleographic ground and presumably it was composed as one work, because in THT 193r6 we can see a dialogue between *Jñānasthite* and *Guṇasaṃpade*.

²⁹ Skt. names are always in the same form in both Toch. (without apocope in A-Toch.). I suppose that Skt. names were important for Buddhism but declined in the way of B-Toch. and imported into A-Toch. without any change.

paper on the top broke off, if the folio was made with two or more papers in order to strengthen the folio itself, whose surface of both sides was applied with varnish-like liquid preventing the soaking of ink. I prefer the latter. This method is used in the case of Japanese original paintings, when papers are thin and weak. In fact, we can see akṣaras from the back side as in THT 083v. Then it looks unwritten, when the paper on the top broke off.

THT 077r (T III Š101.17, Pencil-number 2334)

- 1 weṢṢAṃ [c](ām)p(a)mñ[e]ccu tus(ā)ks(a) nai ñ[ak](e) ārw(e)r tākam ente se kr(e)nt[au]nt[ts(e) sinetre³⁰ wal(o) [p](a)ñ(ā)kt(e)³¹ ś[ai]ṣṣ[en](e) tsāñka(ṃ) oT cw[i] sp(aktānta alā-)
- 2 LAcci tākaM, mapi kca sū cāmpam(e) laklene waste nestsi jñānasthite weṢṢAṃ waṣama epiyac pi tu pkalaR, ente se krent[au](nattse a-)
- 3 ranemi ñemtsa walo ṣai ot rano sū ololyesa ākteke wantare yamaṣa : || guṇasampade weṢṢAṃ cāmpamñeccu s.. + +
- 4 tta ṣpakk anaiṣai epiyac [ka]latsi porcaññaR, cwi araṇemiñ lānte krent yamalñe • || jñānasthite weṢṢAṃ sasāllaṣ palsko(sa snai)
- 5 wyakṣeP, PAKlyauṢ, cau jāta(KAṣṣe me)ske • || riññaktesa³² || mā lauke kca KAtkau sū preke [ste] • śāmñe naumye araṇemi walo tne • a[ru](ñāvati)
- 6 rñe MAskūRA • yaitu ṣai s[ū] (krentauna)ṣṣeṃ tsaiñ[ñ]entsa I(← •) || om no [ña]ke se araṇe(mi wa)lo (āñmn)[e] ka paññK[TA]mñe [p]jerneś[c]ä (tSA)ñkau + + + +³³

<translation>

- 1 (Guṇasampada) says, "Oh Exalted one (← Man of ability), therefore just now we should make(←be) ready. When this virtuous king Sunetra would rise in the Buddha-world, then we should be his tireless servants.
- 2 Well he is somehow able to be our protection in suffering." Jñānasthita says, "Oh my friend, however, remember it! When this virtuous
- 3 king Araṇemi with name was (there), then also he made exceedingly wonderful thing. : || Guṇasampada says, "Oh Exalted one (← Man of ability)! ...
- 4 and also carefully you must remember the good deed of that king Araṇemi." • || Jñānasthita says, "With attention(← jumped thought)
- 5 (and) without hindrance, hear the Jātaka's affair(←connection)! • || with the metre of riññakte ||

³⁰ According to Akanuma (1931 p. 663) *Sunetra* rose into 光音天 (light-sound-heaven) and one of six masters (ibid. p. 431): *Sunetta*, *Mūgapakkha*, *Araṇemi*, *Kuddālaka*, *Haṭṭhipāla* and *Jotipāla*. Here I see the name *Araṇemi* in the third place. In Hamilton (1986 p. 9 line 2–22) we can see the contents: "Ce roi *Sunetra* était dans une existence antérieure un grand roi khan du nom de *Araṇemi*"; le dieu le plus grand = *Jñānasthita*; le dieu le plus petit = *Guṇasampada*.

³¹ Schmidt (2001 p. 303) takes *paññakte* as nom. "sich als Buddha in der Welt erhebt", but I prefer to take it as a previous word of compound, and *paññakte-śaiṣṣene tsāñkam* "he would rise in the Buddha-world" (Chin. 仏国土, Skt. *buddha-kṣetra*, cf. Bernhard 1958 p. 14). *śaiṣṣe* "world" could be translated from Chin. 国土 "country" rather than Skt. *kṣetra* "field", but it is not certain.

³² Schmidt did not translated this word (2001 p.303), but from the following verse in style of 10/11/10/11 (cf. Adams 1999 p. 828) spoken by Jñānasthita, I take it as the name of the verse. Normally Tocharian used loc. with Skt. name (in the metre of ...), but here in perl. with Toch. name (with the metre of *riññakte*) As far as I know, perl. for that aim is only here to see. Semantically, I see no difference, so I dare to maintain my opinion, i.e. the name of the metre between double *daṇḍas*.

³³ This part is a little difficult to understand. After Hamilton (1986 p. 9 line 13–14): "Ce roi s'évertuait vers la béatitude de Bouddha, et, afin de (devenir) Bodhisattva, il n'avait pas son pareil pour renoncer à son corps et à sa tête et pour donner so tout".

Not far the time is exceeded (→ not long ago) • there (was) a king Araṇemi (who was) a human jewel • he was in the city Aruṇāvati •
 6 he was decorated with jewelry of virtues • || There now, however, this king Araṇemi, also in desire, rose for Buddha-worth ...

³⁴THT 078r (T III Š79.30, Pencil-number 2333)

1 *ñiś, ñke : sū ñi yārke śpālme(ṃ) śai pāramitne³⁵ āyorṣṣe mā no k_ilāñ palsko : kr_i ñke tetekā*
ŚAnmyeṃ yaśṣūcañ, lareṃ śauly ñi yaśyeṃtRA sāw ñi wrottsa
 2 *katkauña mā cakravārt[ñ]e (|| lāntsa) weṢṢAṃ saswa srukalyñemeṃ taisa ci kka KAlpāmM, mā ṣ*
nai ñake āyorsa plāc aksasT(.) || walo weṢṢAṃ lari-
 3 *ya yaśṣūcaṃts ek[a](lymi neSAm) O kr_i ñke cai TAñwaññeñcā³⁶ oT(.) ñke ñiś, ysape ykāk,*
KAllāT(.) || om no ñake lā(ṃ)t wrattsai kekamu viduṣa-
 4 *ke³⁷ katkauñaisa (tane wertsioyai?) [ne] lāntas weṢṢAṃ³⁸ || śartanikaine (10x4) || cūmeṃ*
tsre[LA]ññesa wek tarkanoyM, <:> makoymar KAlymi(ṃ)tsa cī
 5 *ñaṣṣūma(R, :) + + + + + + + + marc, : śwātsin eñKAl yñ ci yukṣñ³⁹ PAsT, k[a] <:> + + +*
+ + [ṣṣi]M, te maṃt weṣṣiM, <:> sū ñi larauñesa
 6 (11 akṣaras?) *sa waipṭe : āñme no te-yśimaR,⁴⁰ waīke wes[k]au <: ||> (tumeṃ? kerī)yemane*
araṇemi walo weṢṢAṃ

³⁴ Schmidt puts this folio after THT 079 and 080 influenced by Zieme's translation (content of THT 078, story of supplicants comes after THT 079), but I am not sure because THT 080 is a very meager folio, and there is no dialogue between the king and queen in the Uighur version. And the discussion between the king and vassals (THT 079) would be held after the dialogue between the king and Brahmin Viduṣaka (THT 78). I follow tentatively the order of Sieg/Siegling (1953), i.e. THT 077 → 078 → 079 → 080 → 081.

³⁵ Schmidt translates *pāramit-ne* (loc.) as "gegenüber der Tugend (*pāramitā*)" which is a little difficult to understand. The loc. functions not only as "on, in", but also as "into" (a goal). This expression could correspond with Skt. *Dāna-pāramitā*, Chin. 施到彼岸 (Mvy 914 p. 71) which is one of six *pāramitā* (*dāna, śīla, kṣānti, vīrya, dhyāna, prajñā*, Nakamura p. 1093). *pāramitā* means 絕對完全 "absolute completeness" (Nakamura p. 1121), and *dāna-pāramitā* means "perfection of almsgiving" in order to reach the spiritual awakening (Buddha).

³⁶ In the photo we can read *-ñcā*, but its *trema* (double points on the *akṣara*) seems to be deleted with water. Syntactically this participle should be pl. *-ñcañ* which Sieg/Siegling (1953 p. 17 fn. 14) improved as *-ñcam, ñ → ṃ* is acceptable, but in this folio *virāma*-sign " " is often omitted. Therefore I prefer to see it as a scribal error for *-ñcañ*. The content in Uig. is different from Toch. (Hamilton 1986 p. 9 line 20): "les mendiants indigents et pauvres des quatre coins, dès qu'ils entendirent les brahmanes, vinrent tous, et il leur donna entièrement les choses de toute sorte dont ils avaient besoin".

³⁷ B-Toch. *viduṣake*; the Uighur version (Hamilton 1986 p. 9 line 23) *Rudramukha*; A-Toch. (THT 977r5) *puruhīT* (?). There should be some reasons for the different names, but now I have no idea.

³⁸ The speech of the Brahmin is different from the Uighur version (Hamilton 1986 p. 9 line 26): "«Vous êtes un grand roi. Pourquoi accueillez-vous les propos de méchants calomnieurs? Malheureux, vous ruinez tout ce qu'il y a de provinces et de villes, d'État et d'institutions!»".

³⁹ *-ñ* is incomprehensible. In the photo we can see a correction together with the next word *PAsT* (originally it is *..T*) and the next *kā* can be *ka*. If this *pāda* ends with *ka*, it is suitable for the metre of 4x10, not 10/10/10/11 in Adams 1999 p. 828 and Sieg/Sieg 1953 p.17 fn. 15, but Thomas 1983 p. 273 b). This name of the metre *śartanikaine* is only here to find, and Adams takes the end of *pāda* after *kāwo* which was complemented by Sieg/Sieg (1953 p. 18, fn.1). However, the context including word order is unclear because the previous *pāda* is lacking, especially *śwātsine* (loc.?) in the beginning and *PAsT ka* (intensifier?) in the end. The content of this *pāda* is doubtful, but it should be "The Brahmins wanted to take out the prince".

⁴⁰ This verb-form is to be analyzed as *te* (demon.pron. nt. "it") and /aiśimār/ (1. sg. opt. (not impf. as is in Krause 1952 p.225) of √aik- "to know". This form is only here to see, but from *poysī* "all knower" (*po* "all" and verbal noun of √aik- *aiśī*) it can be analogized, i.e. /e-ai/ → *ey*, /ś/ is palatalized phoneme of /k/ because of following /i/. However, in my opinion, this is not a phonological rule (*sandhi*), but a phonetic simplification with keeping of the semantically important phoneme.

<translation>

- 1 "Now I ... : He was my excellent veneration, my mind for(← of) alms did not disappear until the perfection (of almsgiving) (← into (*dāna-*)*pāramitā*). : If now suddenly supplicants might come (and) beg my lovely life, (that is) the big
- 2 pleasure of me, (but) the kingship(← *Cakravarti*-worth) (is) not (more excellent)". (The queen) says, "Oh my Sir, we would obtain you from the death in such a way, and also now do not tell (←proclaim the speech) about(←with) gift! The king says, "Oh my dear!
- 3 I (am) to the will of supplicants. If they (are) also(←then) needy(← setting their heart), then near by them(←there) even you would find(←obtain) me. Now there, however, *Viduṣaka* came to(←on the opposite side of) the king
- 4 with pleasure (there in front of the assembly?) he says to the king. || in the metre of *ṣartanīka* || "Because of (←with) separation from you I cried(← uttered the voice), ran here and there (← over directions).
- 5 I desired you! : I ... you : (It) overcame me (that) I grab you, (this desire is bigger than) even to eat (: I did ..., so said. (: He ... with my love
- 6 with ... separately : but I myself would know (that) I tell a lie⁴¹. (: || Then) the king *Araṇemi* says (in) smiling,

THT 078v

- 1 /// [w](e)ṢṢAṃ arai : tu kka ka ñi śaul perm(e) st(e) waike w(eskau)⁴²
- 2 /// rkattse⁴³ klaukāwa mā tve ñi KAṣṣi MAṣketaR, tve
- 3 + + ś m[ā] + + + + + + + + mteṃ + + + + + + + + + + (klau)tkam ṣeske kā⁴⁴ tve
brāhmaṇeṇṇimpa t epiṇte sak wī-
- 4 (na) w(ä)rpā[t](ai) + + + + + + + + ś[] en[a] + + + + + + + + + (wa)[o] weṢṢAṃ
brāhmaṇiśka MAkcepi⁴⁵ ñike kektseṇe krarma-
- 5 (rtsa) klauka[ñcä] + + + + + + + + ntsi : [kr,i] + + kimeṃ mā [PA] + + + + + + + + + ||
śānaśRAṇkārne (4x18) || waike lāre yāmTAr ksa ṣek somo-

⁴¹ *waike* means "Lüge" (TEB II p. 243), but here it is not suitable if the sentence is an independant clause. If this word comes from \sqrt{we} "to say" and *wek* "Stimme" (ibid. *wek*- "lügen" does not exist), then it could be *figura etymologica* "I say a speech" → "I say only" or "reinforced voice" → "violently". I prefer the latter if it coincides with Uighur "tint des propos odieux et rudes" (Hamilton 1986 p. 9 line 26), but other examples of *waike* show the meaning "a lie". Therefore, I suppose that this clause is dependant on *te* "it", then it can be a sentence structure of "it ... that".

⁴² *w(eskau)* is completed by Sieg/Siegling (1953 p. 18 fn. 6), but it is funny as is in previous fn., and I see no trace of *-e* on *wa*. I suppose that this word is not *weskau*, but *waṣe* "slander" or *warñai* "etc." which begins with *wa*-.

⁴³ If this word is a scribal error for (*e*)*rkatte*, we can assume "I became contemptuous", then it is suitable for the sentence following.

⁴⁴ Schmidt takes this *kā* as an intensifier "Nur allein", on the other hand Thomas takes it as an interrogative "Warum hast du" (2001 p. 308 fn. 40). I cannot find the intensifier *kā* in the Berlin collection. An intensifier is /k(ä)/ which did not become /kā/, because /ä/ and /ā/ are different phonemes. A similar example is *kā ñiś ṣeske* (THT 298) and the word order is free if this part is in verse. The sentence could begin with *ṣeske*, and this *kā* could be put in the second place as an interrogative, i.e. "Why you alone".

⁴⁵ *MAkcepi* is a gen. of /mäkte/ "self" and also /mäksu/ "which". Schmidt takes "self" and translates "Dein Körper wird **dir** selbst doch schwer werden" because of *-ñcä*(.) (← *m-ç* suffix for pron. 2. sg.). Another possibility is to take *cä* as the beginning of the next word, e.g. *cāñcare* "prety" or *cāmpamo* "able". I prefer the latter, because "Dein ... dir selbst" is a little intricate, but the context is still unclear because of lacuna.

6 (tkñe) waikesa + + + + (:) ś[a]kmaiyā(nte cāmpa)⁴⁶mñe pūdñä + + + + + + + pkārsa :
oKT, wrotstsana nraintane kluTKAṣṣeñca se

<translation>

- 1 /// (Vidūṣaka) says, "Oh! : Just this(← it) is my life (and) worth, a lie ...
- 2 /// I became (contemptuous?). You are not my teacher, you ...
- 3 ... not ... (he) would (become) ... Why did you alone enjoy happiness and satisfaction
meanwhile together with Brahmins?
- 4 The king says, "Oh small Brahmin! Of which body would then
- 5 become heavy? ... to ... : if (you) from (speech) not ... in the metre of śanaśrāṅkāṛ || (When
one would love somewhat a lie (and) always similarly
- 6 with lie ... : The (ability) of ten powers, the Buddha ... You must know (it)! : This (man),
making (someone) go(←turn back) to(←in) eight big Hells, ...

THT 079 (T III Š75.4, Pencil-number 2089)

- 1 (mā MAntana)TAṛñ⁴⁷ ptarkaso śconai mapi wase ññ KAṣṣññe i ..⁴⁸ ///
- 2 rmeṃ kertteṃ oñkor MAlkānte śle yārke lāntas weskeṃ⁴⁹ • || ā⁵⁰ ///
- 3 mā weS, cāmpalyi erkaṭTAññe kalts⁵¹ ///
- 4 TAṛñ, MAkte teṃ waTKAścerñ, KAṣṣiṃ ypoyme(ṃ)⁵² ///
- 5 (e)pe saswe wess eñtRA epe brāhmaṇeṃ mā ra tsak weS, c[i]⁵³ ///
- 6 sanune kekamu nesau⁵⁴ yeSAñ pi ekaḷymi tākaṃ seṃ ///

<translation>

- 1 Do not scold me. Dismiss hatred! (It is) my poison. The (image?) of a teacher ///

⁴⁶ For semantic reasons, I supplement ś[a]kmaiyā(nte cāmpa)mñe "ability of ten powers" for three akṣaras, which would be an apposition of the next word, "Buddha" because of nom. -mñe (not adj. -ññe).

⁴⁷ A-Toch. THT 0976r1: maR, MAntā(cāR) pres. class V mid. 2. pl. "you do not scold". According to Schmidt (2001 p. 305) it is (mā MAntana)TAṛñ, pres. VI mid. 2. pl. after THT 1459 a1, but in Krause 1952 p. 266 this root shows Ps. XII (2. pl. is not written). Another possibility is subj. V māntaTAṛñ, which could function as prohibition with negation like an injunctive. Apropos, I have some doubt whether Toch. Konjunktiv can be called a subjunctive in English. Prof. Saito suggested *prospektiver Konjunktiv* in Toch. Originally subj. is used in subordinate clauses, but in Toch. it is used in main clauses. I prefer to use *Injunktiv* rather than *Konjunktiv*, and Toch. verbal system would be constituted with an indicative (pres. and pret.) and an injunctive (timeless), but now I follow the traditional system.

⁴⁸ In the photo, two remnants of ink are seen, which could be a part of m, not k, t, n, p, l, w, ś, s. Then it could be *ime* "memory, awareness, Skt. smṛty".

⁴⁹ A-Toch. THT 976r3–4: (āmāśā)ññ(,) KAlycaṃ kāresyo tānaśoliS, yokmaṃ{c} šmoRAŚ, śla wāktasurñe lāntac(,) tRAñk(iñc). B-Toch. here -rmeṃ (absolute) could be after A-Toch. "having stood at the gate of Dānaśālā (= alms-giving site)". In A-Toch. MAlkānte "to put together" is omitted, and reduced with instr. -yo. This means that B-Toch. is older than A-Toch., viz. A-Toch. could be an artificial language based on B-Toch. In comparison with A- and B-Toch., I suppose that the swords might be "gathered all together for the sake of not using them in front of the king".

⁵⁰ If this is the name of the metre beginning with ā-, it differs from A-Toch. (THT 976r4) phull(enaṃ) 4x14, and the number of syllables is also different if pāda c begins with mā (see next fn.). A-Toch. śkaṃ nāTAK, and caS could be added *metri causa* or used as an intensifier and ññ(,) (←ññ "your") could be added to avoid the hiatus e-e (A-Toch. nom. pl. m. -lye instead of -lyi in B-Toch.). This could mean that even within Toch. languages there is a difference because of synchronic and diachronic reason.

⁵¹ A-Toch. THT 976r5: mā śkaṃ nāTAK, waS, [c]āmplye ññ(,) erkātune caS(,) KLAssi

⁵² A-Toch. THT 976v2: MA[nT] wāTKAśś [ñ]i śñi KAṣṣiṃ ypeyāS, tSAknātsi

⁵³ A-Toch. THT 976v2–3: mā [t]e nāTAK, caṃ [b]rā(maṃ) e(pe) mā te waS, entsatRA was nū tañne wKAñnyo nātkiS, yāshuntaśśūL, mā cāmplye. B-Toch. c[i]- could be cāmpalyi for cāmpalyi "be able to".

⁵⁴ A-Toch. THT 976v4: oklopac, kakmu nasaM,

- 2 having (stood near the door?) they put the swords together (and) say to the king with respect. ///
- 3 We are not able to endure (your) anger. ///
- 4 (Do not scold?) me. Why do you decide so(← it) (to pull out) my teacher from the country? ///
- 5 The Lord would take(←grab) whether the Brahmin or us, Not at all we (are able to endure?) ///
- 6 I came across a danger. Would this be also to your will? ///

THT 080⁵⁵ (T III Š67, THT 072 und THT 1684 together in the same case)

- 1 /// ..[KA] k[au]tatsi ///
- 2 /// (araṇe)[m](iṃ) lānT, ścirona [r]. [k]. ///
- 3 /// TKAsTü āṛṢṢAlle ka[p.] ///
- 4 /// .[s]. nesT, || te kekly[au] ///
- 5 /// nte yamaṣatai mā .e ///
- 6 /// .[änta] PAlkormeṃ ///

<translation>

- 1 /// ... to split ///
- 2 /// ... the king (Araṇemi?), a hard (word?) ///
- 3 /// ... (it) should be given up ... ///
- 4 /// ... (it) is ... || Having heard it ... ///
- 5 /// ... you have done. Not ... ///
- 6 /// ... having seen ... ///

THT 081r (T III Š102.6, Pencil-number 2340, left side is lost)

- 1 (namane)⁵⁶ • piṣuwem⁵⁷ akaLṢAlyem)Šcä makāyäkne (pa)pauta[rme](ṃ) • weṢAṇṇmešc, SAśūskaṃ neSAṃ ksa nū yeSAśc, aṇmaṣṣ(e) reki (|| ka)pilava(r)ṇ(e)

⁵⁵ This folio following THT 079 could show the conversation between the king and vassals. The scene is described in the Uighur version (Zieme 2001 p. 417 U 2293 Blatt "156" *Übersetzung*), though it is not coincident: (01) ["Wie dem auch] sei, der Tod wird kommen! Von euch getrennt werde ich sein." (02–11) Weiter so wehklagen wird er: "Ihr werdet m[ich] nicht erlösen können! Zahllose, zehntausende Existenzen [hindurch] bin ich geboren, bin ich gestorben. Den nutzlosen Körper [habe ich] abgelegt. Jetzt ist mir großer Nutzen gekommen. Seid ihr alle mit mir eines Sinnes! Wenn ihr mir gegenüber gute Gedanken hegt, laßt gegen diesen meinen [...] Brahmanen keine schlechten Gedanken aufkommen! Versorgt [Land und] Stadt, Volk und Leute, nichtshabende und arme, [elende] und bedürftige Bettler! Hoffungslos sollen sie nicht sein! (11–14) Seit ich auf dem [Thron] des Königs sitze, sind so und so viele Bettler gekommen. Was sie erbat, habe ich ihnen gegeben. Wenn ich weiter so gebe, wird das Hab und Gut (der) sieben Schatzhäuser meiner Stadt Aruṇavati gänzlich leer bleiben. (14–16) Nicht einen einzigen Tag habt ihr mir ein grimmiges Gesicht entgegengehalten. Mein Herz habt ihr nicht verletzt. (16–18) Wenn eure Herzen, weil ihr aus [Gier] nach Macht und Stärke ge[...], bestraft, gescholten oder geflucht habt, [...] oder nachlässig geworden sind, {von} den Sünden [möget ihr] befreit [werden]."

⁵⁶ This is a part. pres. mid. of class VI (nasal suffix), but I cannot decide what the root is, though Sieg/Siegling (1953 p. 19 fn. 4) take √skai "sich bemühen", which I am dubious about because of -na- of -namane and nā of skaināmane. Judging from accent system, na of -namane should be accented nā.

⁵⁷ uwem is not "gelehrt[est]en" (Schmidt 2001 p. 309), "geschickt" (TEB II p. 170) or "learnèd(?)" (Adams 1999 p. 71) but a suffix meaning "in number" (Tamai 2011 p. 309). There is no word beginning with u- in autochthonal Toch. but wā-, and uwe comes always after numbers, viz. ṣKAś "6" or śter "4". Therefore, uwe is rather a dependant word. I suppose that -u in Toch. was a suffix with nuance "remaining" (against -i with "moving") and -w- (because of -u) was inserted as an *anaptyxis* (*svarabhakti*) between u and nom. sg. -e, and treated as a collective noun.

- 2 (*brāhmaṇe weṢṢAṃ spantai*⁵⁸ *KAṣṣi*) *wem* || *rudramukhe brāhmaṇe weṢṢAṃ* || *niṣkramāṇne* (5/7/5) || *walo aknātsa su MARSau ṣaṇ āṇm atsai[K.] ñeM ara[n]e*
- 3 (*mi • yāṃṣate ñiśś erkatte*) ○ *lyautsaṇ PAsT⁵⁹, ṣaṇ⁶⁰, ypoymem wertsaints enepre • srukor aiśaumyep⁵⁹ olypo (KA)ṛnoyt(a)r(←tār)⁶⁰ PAsT⁵⁹, mā [k]wī-*
- 4 (*pe rmoyTAR₅ : su ke⁶¹ ñem wa*) *Olo yāṃṣate ñiśś erkatte MAkte ṣ tem kelu : || akaLṢAlyi weskem upādhyāya k_use weSAñ⁶², tannem⁶²*
- 5 (*yamaṢA(l)[e]* (•) *brāhmaṇe weṢṢAṃ tu*)[*s*]āksa *nai yeS₅, ñū yaūt[k]orsa [pc]iṣo araṇemiñ lānte uttare ñemtsa so[m]śke ste ṣaṇ ṣaulameṇ snai wāki (la)*
- 6 (*rauñesa • sū no walo pañāKTAmñe perne*)ṣṣe *akālksa po [ai](ṣṣeṇca ne)[m](ce)k cau uttareṇ [m]ñ(cu)ṣkem yeSAṃññ aiṢṢAṃ cwī lkāllona [LA]klenta ñiś⁶², (utta)*

<translation>

- 1 ... • Having flattered five pupils (in number) in many manners • (Rudramukha) says to them, "My sons! I have somehow my own word for you. || The Brahmin Kapilavaṇṇa
- 2 says, "Respectfully (we would like to hear you!), (our) teacher should tell (us). The Brahmin Rudramukha says. || in the metre of *niṣkramāṇ* || The ignorant king (who has) forgotten even himself, (is) Araṇemi by name. •
- 3 He was(←made) hostile (against) me, expelled me from his own country in front of (his) vassels • The death would afflict exceedingly (for) a wise man (i.e. me). He was shameless (← he did not bow to a shame).
- 4 He, so called bad guy, the king was(←made) hostile (against) me. How should I also endure it? The pupils say, "Oh teacher! What do we then(←there)
- 5 have to do?" The Brahmin says, "Well thereby, go with my order! There is a (little) son for(←of) the king Araṇemi, Uttara by name, (who is) loved(←with love) (as if it is) without difference from (the king's) own life.
- 6 The king, however, (is) a giver of all (things) because of (←with) desire of Buddha worth. Surely he gives the prince Uttara to(←of) you. The sufferings (which the king) should see, I

⁵⁸ /spāntai/ seems to be an obl. from the form (nom. is not attested) and could be an adv. as is in Adams 1999 p. 715 (not in TEB I). According to Krause (1952 p. 49 § 43) this form is an adv. which is suffixed with -ai direct to the root √spānt "to trust", but other examples show no grammatical rule, viz. *ṣatkai* (← √kātk), *tsorikai-k* (← √tsānk) and *lukṣaitse* (← pres. caus. stem of √luk). One possibility is to see it as a root noun, but the obl. suffix -ai/ cannot be added to consonant stem (same form in nom. and obl.). Another possibility is a loanword from Iranian *spānta-* "heilig, sanctus" (Bartholomae 1904 p. 1619). The meaning "trustfully" is not suitable here because a teacher cannot speak trustfully to pupils, therefore, Schmidt translates it as "getrost". Then I would take it as an independant word with respectful nuance.

⁵⁹ -pi is a gen. marker for adj. The word *aiśaumye* is originally an adj., but became a noun. Schmidt takes it as possessive "von einem Weisen", but I prefer to take it as a dative function "for wise man, i.e. me".

⁶⁰ Sieg/Siegling (1953 p. 19 fn. 8): (*ri*)*toyt(a)r* for -TAr (√rit "to search"). Schmidt (2001 p. 310): *nanoytār* (√nān "to show oneself" and he translates it as "soll hingenommen werden") but in the photo I recognize it as *..rmoyt(ä)r*. "r" over "n" is visible, so I suppose that it would be (*sKA*)*rmoyt(ä)r* 3. sg. pres. VI from √skār "to threaten" but instances show -rr- for -m-. Another possibility is *KArnoytār* from √kām "to beat, to destroy". Then it is semantically good together with *olypo* "exceedingly". *PAsT* is used as a reinforcing particle.

⁶¹ *ke* is presumably an intensifier which is related with *k(ä)* (cf. Adams 1999 p. 188), but together with /ñem/ here, it could include another nuance, i.e. pejorative sence "so called bad guy!".

⁶² *tannem* is *hapax legomenon*. Adams (1999 p. 279): "± thereto". TEB II p. 196: "dabei". I suppose this is a scribal error for *tane* "there".

THT 081v

- 1 (ri mñcuṣkentsē⁶³ lkātsi āyu : kr,i yeS, nī) ce akāLK(.) kan(aśceR, oT,) [ñ]k[e] ñśam(eṃ)
ś, ⁶⁴asta[r]ṣṣ(e) yāknesa pruccamñe ya[nm](a)c(e)R, brāhma(ñi)
- 2 (weskeṃ MAkte waTKAṢṢAṃ upādhyāye lateṃ) brāhmaṇi : tune(ṃ) [c](ai) brāhmaṇi tot ike
posTAṃ ynemane a[ra]ṇemiñ lānte yapoyne kameṃ (tā)
- 3 (⁶⁵rrine yaipormeṃ ālyauceś we)Oskem bho bho • k,se [pi] ksa weSAñ, kekamoR, orocce lanT,
śarSAṣṣi || tane plaktu[KA]ñña brāhma
- 4 (ṇem lyelyakormeṃ kercīye⁶⁶)Onn(e) yopsa śle yārke l[ā]ntaś we[ṢṢA]ṃ ṇakta alyeK, ypoy[ṣ]i
brāhmaṇi parna [k]lyent[RA] SAweṃ lkātsi ñā
- 5 (skentRA • || walo weṢṢAṃ rameR ecce) pwāyarme KArtse yamiñ cai ñi || ta[n]e brāhmaṇi
kerciyeṃne yaipormeṃ poñc, śar koś ceccalorsa ka lānte
- 6 (yarke yamaskem || tane a)[r](a)ṇemi walo brā[h](ma)ṇem [wra]tsai (tSA)ṇiko[rmeṃ] KAṣṣ[ī]ññe
yāknesa asānne ly[ā]mateme || tumem (tse)ññai uppāLAṃ⁶⁷

<translation>

- 1 would give (for) the prince Uttara's seeing(← to see) : If you fulfill this desire of mine, then also from me, you gain the excellence in(←with) the manner of instruction (Skt. *śāstra*). The Brahmins
- 2 say, "As the teacher orders!" Brahmins went out. : Then the Brahmins, going meanwhile step to step, came into the country of the king Araṇemi. Having entered this
- 3 city, they say to each other, "Good, good! • Who ever might let the great king know our visit? || There a female gatekeeper, having seen the Brahmins,
- 4 entered the palace, and she says to the king with honor, "Oh my Sir! Brahmins from(←of) another country stand outside. They want to see you(← the lord). ||
- 5 The king says, "Lead them here in a hurry! They are benefactors(← good doers) for me. || There Brahmins, having entered the palace, even with raising all hands high,
- 6 gave honor to(←for) the king. || There the king Araṇemi, having stood up on the opposite to Brahmins, made them sit on the seat with a manner of a teacher. || Then (with both eyes of ??) blue lotus ...

⁶⁸PK NS 35r

1 /// ñ(ā)skentTRA || (walo we)ṢṢAṃ rameR, e(cce pwāyarme) /// =THT 81v4–5

⁶³ This construction is "gen. subject" for inf. *lkātsi* "to see", viz. "the prince (will) see (it)". The gen. shows a function of agent, and Toch. inf. became nouns. We can see a similar construction in Latin, *accusativus cum infinitivo*.

⁶⁴ The *virāma*-line is a scribal error. We should read it as *śastarṣṣe*. I tried to find other possibilities, e.g. *keñ śam.ś* (all.) or *keñ* (causalis), but in vain. *ñke* is visible, *ñśameṃ* is attested, and with *śastar* (←Skt. *śāstra*) it makes sense.

⁶⁵ Double consonants *rr* after vowel *ā* in order to make a clear consonant. It is phonologic /r/.

⁶⁶ According to TEB II (p. 186) and Adams (1999 p. 196) *kercīye* is pl. *tantum* but it could be sg. form. Nom. pl. is in TEB II **kerc(c)īyi*, in Adams *kerccī*. Both do not exist. Attested examples are: *kerci* (THT 073b4) and *kercci* (075v1), both are in verse, so they could be *kercīye*. *tā kercyenmeṃ* (394v1) *kercciye(ṃ)ṣṣe* (520v4, pl.? and -ṣṣe). There is no reason for pl. *tantum*, especially *tā kercyenmeṃ* is sg. because of demon.pron. f. sg. *tā*. I think that -e is nom. sg., -y- is an *anaptyxis* (Skt. *svarabhakti*) because of *i*, and -eṃ is obl. sg.

⁶⁷ If the number of lost *akṣaras* is 13–15 between PK NS 35r2 and r3, this part could be coincident with PK NS 35r3 (*naumi*)Kane *kreñc eśanesa* "with both jewel-like good eyes".

⁶⁸ This folio is published with photos in Couvreur 1964 p. 238–239. PK NS = Pelliot koutchéen Nouvelle Série kept in Bibliothèque nationale de France in Paris. I put notations of the coincident parts in THT.

- 2 /// (yamas)k(eṃ) [||] tane araṇ(e)mī walo brāhmaṇeṃ (w)r(atsai tsaṇkormeṃ) /// =THT 81v6
 3 /// (naumi)KAne kreñc eśanesa brāhmaṇeṃ PAlkormeṃ [w]e(śśAṃ) (12 akṣaras until 82r1)
 4 /// (ñeM, KA)ly[w]e keklyauṣormeṃ tane k[m]eM, || walo we(śśAṃ) /// =THT 82r2

PK NS 35v

- 1 /// (MA)kt(e) ksa [l]k(āTAr) t(a)ñ(“) m[aiM], klyomo l(a)l(aṃ)[ṣ](ke) /// =THT 82r3
 2 /// (ol)[y]p(o)tse : mapi ñk(e) ñaṣṭaR, tve pūdñäKTaññe (perne) /// =THT 82r4
 3 /// liT, PAsṭ : || tane walo paññäKTaññepi pe(r)[n](entse) ///
 4 /// .. paññä[KT]aññepi pe(r)n(e)tse ñeM, kā ///

THT 082r (T III Š91.28, Pencil-number 2332)

- 1 /// [t.] k_uce w[än]taresa kekamoṣ() takāS, ytarintse ś(e)śśuko(ś)⁶⁹
 2 /// .e kmeM, || walo weśśAṃ KAṣṣinta⁷⁰ yessa warñai śaiṣṣe
 3 /// (|| karu)ṇapralāpne (4x12) || MAkte ksa lkāTAr tañ“, maiM, klyomo la(laṃṣke :)
 4 /// (ra)mT, śc[ir](i)nn(e :) + + + wate no lalaṃṣke olypo[t](s)e I⁷¹
 5 /// s.ä + + + + + + + + + + + yāri .e + +
 6 /// ś we[ṣ](ṣAṃ) + + +

<translation>

- 1 /// With which thing had you come? Drinkings (and) eatings of journey
 2 /// (having heard (your) fame, here) we came. || The king says, "Oh my teachers! You and so on,
 the world
 3 /// || in the metre of (karu)ṇapralāpa || How else does one estimate you (←see your evaluation)
 (as) noble (and) soft?
 4 /// like (moon?) in stars : ... the second, however, (is) very soft
 5 (pāda a of the second verse) Well indeed you desire the Buddha-worth ... the way ...
 6 /// he says to ...

THT 082v

- 1 /// [L]KA + + +

⁶⁹ Schmidt 2001 p. 311: "Vom Weg ermüdet (?)" for ytarintse ś(e)śśuko(ś) quoting Winter's *Studia Tocharica* p. 212 f. which I tried to get from Prof. Winter directly, but in vain. Judging from the reduplication, it should be a past participle. The function of the preceding gen. could be subjective, objective, possessive and partitive relating to the nominal participle. Schmidt's "ermüdet" does not apply to these cases. A pret. stem /suk/ could be from √tsuk (caus. of √yok "to drink", śuke "Skt. rasa Geschmack?" cf. Krause 1952 p. 276), if ts could become ś (Krause ibid. p. 21). A reduplication is suitable to caus., and the geminated śś could show a border of morpheme. I assume this nominal participle as "drinkings", and the next word could be śaśāwoṣ "eatings" from √swā "to eat". Then this passage could be "drinkings and (eatings) of the way" → "food for journey". Saito with Catt informed of THT 538b4 nkantentse tase(mane) for Skt. rajatasya prativarnika "fake silver" as an example for gen. + participle in Toch.

⁷⁰ Schmidt (2001 p. 311): "Lehrer euresgleichen". KAṣṣinta could be a voc., and yessa warñai is not "euresgleichen" but "beginning with you" (→ you and so on).

⁷¹ In this folio, circa 45 akṣaras (including virāmas and visargas) are written in one line, e.g. in THT 078 r1, and the space for string hole would be the length of 4 akṣaras, e.g. THT 079 r3 and r4. Then the line with a string hole can include circa 3 pādas, and this "1" is the end mark of pāda d. In PK NS 35 v2 after (ol)[y]p(o)tse we can see ":" which is not the end of the verse, because we can see it after PAsṭ : || in r3. The "1" in THT 078 could show No. 1 of the verse, but there is no No. 2 (instead, : ||). Therefore, I prefer to see it as a space filling mark at the end of the line.

2 /// ñś. + +

3 /// || walo weṣṣAṃ ṣaṇṇ palsk(o)⁷² ||

4 /// [t.]ll(e) ot tañ` st[e] kr(eṃ)t wāntarene ekūtattse nestsi • ||

5 /// yai kauc iprerne : toṃ wi wāntarwa tne kalma⁷³ ksa kalloy`

6 /// r [ñ]iś`⁷⁴ poyśiṇṇ⁷⁵ ākālksa : yaltse śaulanma ra mā ñi kca ynā(ñMA)⁷⁶

<translation>

1-2 (uncertain)

3 /// || The king tells his own thought. ||

4 /// (it) should be ... then it is yours to be helpful in good thing. • ||

5 /// he went up high in the sky. : He might obtain there the two things through early in the morning (?)

6 /// to the wood because of (←with) the desire to be (←of) all-knower(= Buddha). : Thousand lives also (are) not my esteem (= Buddha worth is more honorable than 1000 human lives).

THT 083r (T III Š90.8, Pencil-number 2331, verso is dropped off)

1 /// [n.] aṣkār[o]⁷⁷ : lareṇṇemeṇ t[s]relñ(e)s(a) saṃsārn(e) [KA](r)py(eṃ) ce p(e)lyks(a)t[ai]
(twe no :) ///

2 /// (śa)nmausa śānmyatai prākṛe tve PArkṛeṇ prekentsa : ña[k]e nai printsar ce uppāl le⁷⁸ ///

3 /// (e)Oñkormēṇ kenūne laMAAsTArne⁷⁹ au(ṇ)tsatene rupaśke⁸⁰ kantwas(a) skāw[a](tsi) ///

⁷² Schmidt (2001 p. 311): "Der König spricht für sich", but *palsko* "thought" can be an obl. (object of *weṣṣAṃ* "he says"). "für sich" would be *ṣaṇṇ-añmtsā*.

⁷³ *kalma* is unknown. Judging from the predicate *kalloy* opt. 3. sg. "he will obtain", *wāntarwa* pl. "things" is the object, so *kalma* should be the subject of the sentence. Another possibility is *kalmak-sa* perl., and if *kalma* is a scribal error for *kālyam* "early in the morning" (cf. Edgerton 1953 p. 181) and *-k* could be an analogy to *tsaṇkai-k* adv. "in the morning", which is semantically the same, but the perl. with adv. is impossible, so it could be a double scribal error. I would like to accept the latter because an indefinitum *ksa* "any, some" is not suitable to the context. Apropos, I think that *ksa* is not only an "adjective" (Adams 1999 p. 242), but also an "adverb", and it is used sometimes *metri causa* like *no* "but", when one syllable is necessary.

⁷⁴ In the photo I do not see *r [ñ]iś`*, but .. *rtoś`*, and it could be *wartos`* "to/for the wood". In TEB II p. 238 and Adams 1999 p. 580, this word is registered as *wartto* "forest", but *warto* is also attested, e.g. THT 044 r2 *wartone*. Geminated *tt* is because of *r*, but phonologically /wärtto/, and in Toch. *rt* was kept very well, e.g. *sportomane*. Presumably *rtt* is a form influenced by a foreign language.

⁷⁵ This word is *poyśiṇṇe* and *metri causa -e* (obl. sg. m. for next word m.) is omitted and *-ññ* → *-ṇñ*. Apropos, next /ākālks/ is an alternant (sg.: m. and pl.: f.), not n.[m.sg.] "noun whose gender in the singular is masculine" as is in Adams 1999. Moreover, there was no neuter in Toch. noun (except pronoun), though there had been nt-neuter originally (cf. TEB I p. 122). In my opinion pl. f. was formed with /-ā/, on the other hand, pl. m. with /-i/. This "alternant" is one of the Toch. peculiarities.

⁷⁶ If the metre is 5/7 in one *pāda* as is in the preceding (if it begins with *wartos*), this word would be *ynāñMAññe* "esteem".

⁷⁷ Schmidt 2001 p. 312: "(wurdest du) zurück(gehalten)", but /āskār/ "back" (*-o* is movable *metri causa*) cannot be used as "zurückhalten". I recognize [r]n(e) before *aṣkār(o)*, and *-[r]n(e)* could be a middle verbal form with suffixed pron. 3. sg. "him", a noun itself, e.g. *tarne* "vertex", or a noun in loc., e.g. *iprer-ne* "in the air space". Anyway, I take *aṣkār(o)* as adv. "back, reverse".

⁷⁸ *uppāl* could be *uppāll* (double *l* before *e-*?), and the the next remnant of *akṣara* shows a single consonant (not ligature or vertically long *akṣara*), e.g. *enestai* "secretly". Schmidt's "lotos(gleichen)?" is possible, but *eneśle* "like" needs comitative. I would take it as *enestai* "secretly" tentatively.

⁷⁹ This verb is in pres., but the next one is pret. It is possible that one of them is a scribal error, or this sentence could be a direct speech.

⁸⁰ *rupaśke* is, according to TEB II p. 232 a diminutive of Skt. *rūpa* "Gesichtchen", *hapax legomenon*, and this meaning comes presumably from *skāwa(tsi)* "to kiss" (ibid. p. 257) which is also *hapax* (cf. Krause 1952 p. 300: "wörtl. 'bedecken'? Vgl. ai. *skauti*"). These two words are uncertain, and the meanings of both seem to be *ad hoc*. I would like to

4 /// *śaula*⁸¹ *preñcai sau*(←*soṃ*)*śka se wate appakke*⁸² *snai tRAñko ñake PAsT*˘ *rinAsTA(r)c(i) t. p.* ///
 5 /// (we)ṢṢAṃ *āppa ate yāmtsi PA[kn](a)s[ta]rñ*˘ || *walo weṢṢAṃ larekka brāhmaṇe(m)tS*˘ *āyor aiskauc**˘ || ///

6 /// [n]e weṢṢAm : *saswa appakka (yākṣi) [c]aimP**˘ *skente mā brāhmaṇi PAsT*˘ *ñke śwāñ*˘ *ce yolo* ///
 <translation>

- 1 /// ... back : with separation from beloved one in this poor(← low) Saṃsāra, (you, however,) were tormented (:) ...
- 2 /// With fetter you were bound firmly for(← with) long time. : Just now leave this lotus (secretly?!) ...
- 3 /// having grasped ... he makes him get down on his knees (and) began to grieve about his pretty figure with the speech. ...
- 4 /// Oh my life-supporter, my son! This second little father (= the king) throws you away now without fault ...
- 5 /// (The prince) says, "Oh my father! You intend to take me away!". || The king says, "Oh my darling! I give you (as) a gift for Brahmins. || ...
- 6 /// in ... (the prince) says. : "Oh my lord, father! Those are (Yakṣas), not Brahmins. They will then eat me. This angry ...

THT 084r (T III Š101.19, Pencil-number 2330)

1 /// *n. yakṣ[ā]ts*˘ *ṣarnene taṣta[r]ñ*˘ ///
 2 /// (mā)[TA]R˘ *lāntso lyelyakormem wRA(tts)[ai]* ///
 3 /// l(.)[o]cä || *tū keklyau[ṣ]o(rmem)* ///
 4 /// *rya pratiṃ epiyac*˘ ○ ///
 5 /// *yeSAñ nauṢ**˘ *pelaikne* ///
 6 /// [p TA]ttāwsa *SARwānaṣṣe* ///

<translation>

- 1 /// You put me in the hands of Yakṣas. ...
- 2 /// having seen the mother, the queen, opposite to ...

take *kantwasa* not as "with tongue" but as "with speech" because of its idiomatic usage. If *skāw*- in Toch. relates with Skt. $\sqrt{\text{sku}}$ "to tear" as by Krause, this passage could be "he began to grieve(←fulfill his eyes with tear) about his pretty figure with the speech". It is not sure but better semantically. Another possibility for Toch. $\sqrt{\text{skāw}}$ is "to praise" which could be assumed from the context. Anyway, the meanings of the words in this sentence are due to *hapax legomena* quite dubious.

⁸¹ Sieg/Siegling's *śaula preñcai* is a compound *śaul-a-preñcai* because of -a- which is an accented *anaptyxis* /ä/ (cf. Bernhard 1958 p. 21-22) and a voc. which ends with -ai. The next word *soṃśka* is also a voc., but a scribal error *sau-* for *soṃ-* is interesting (cf. Stumpf 1990 p. 71). The function of Toch. *anusvāra* is quite different from Skt. (nasalization of vowels), viz. /n/ and /m/. Sometimes it was omitted even in Skt. documents written in the Toch. area, when the Toch. could not understand it as is in other languages and Toch. *au* was written because of Skt. and expressed, in my opinion, /ō/ which is not a Toch. phoneme because there was no long-short-opposition. It could be also understandable from the shape of initial *au-* and *ai-* which are *o-* and *e-* plus long vowel sign. If this hypothesis is right, the change of diphthongs to monophthongs in A-Toch. is easy to explain.

⁸² Schmidt 2001 p. 312: "Dieser da ist [dein] zweites Väterchen, [ein Väterchen] ohne Arg. Jetzt verläßt dich (dein erster Vater)". Another possibility in my opinion is: "The second father (= the king) throws you away now without fault", i.e. (my) first father is a Brahmin who would take the prince. I think that my opinion is better, because a diminutive (-*kke* ← -*śke*?) father which is a subject of the sentence would be used in a family like *āppa* "father" (not *pācer*) or *larekka* "darling" in next line.

- 3 /// ... || having heard it ...
 4 /// ... remembering the decision ...
 5 /// your earlier law ...
 6 /// she (has) put ... of the face ...

THT 084v

- 1 /// (sau)[šk](a) arañcäşşu⁸³ şaiyi(şka?) ///
 2 /// y.T wenempa pkwalñe ///
 3 /// kemtsa ktormem au○ ///
 4 /// (ā)[li]nesāmtpi RAskre .. ○ ///
 5 /// [ā]ntpi PAśne⁸⁴ sā_U taşitr ālīn(e) ///
 6 /// (KA)[y]m(i)n sportūRA sau(←som)ške aumene e(mpele?) ///

<translation>

- 1 /// Oh my son, lovely kid! ...
 2 /// the trust together with both of us ...
 3 /// having strewed ... over the earth ...
 4 /// with both palms violently ...
 5 /// on both breasts she has put (her) palms ...
 6 /// The son turned around (in all) directions in dreadful(?) misery ...

THT 085r (T III Š80.31, Pencil-number 2329)

- 1 (latauPA)şşusa⁸⁵ kampāl aurcce sā_U ysārasa • weksa sr(a)kañce kwoyTArne taīsa snai KArsto 3
 || tumem uttare [m](ñcu)[ş]k(e) wcukaisa māTAR lāntso enku
 2 weŞAnneścā şarya ammakki poññ⁸⁶ āppai mā ñis cempaṃtS rakşatsents aiŞŞAṃ || tane
 aranemiñ lānte (mñcuške)nne enKAltsa po kektseñmem LA-
 3 kleñ⁸⁷ syel[m]e⁸⁷ (LAc-neŚ?) ○ ylāre kaklautk[au] TArraskemane⁸⁸ rekisa uttareṃ

⁸³ Schmidt (2001 p. 312): "[Mein] (liebes Sohn)chen, [mein] Herzchen, [mein] Kind(chen)", but *arañcäşşu* is a voc. of adj. relating to the next noun, e.g. THT 251v6 *rşāKAññeşşu kaurşu* (voc.) for Skt. *rşipuñigava*. According to Schmidt (ibid. p. 313 fn. 60), *şaiyişka* means "Kindchen, Tierjunges".

⁸⁴ *PAśne* is emended to perl. *PAśnesa* by Winter (cf. Schmidt 2001 p. 313 fn.62; 1974 p. 323 Anm. 1), but I think that a loc. is better because of the predicate *taşitr* impf. "she has put". If it is so, dual *-ne* and loc. *-ne* could be single *-ne* caused by haplogy. I see that this sentence is in verse, because two syllables *-cā-* from /pāścāne/) and *ā* from *taşitr* (3. sg. *-tār/*) are *metri causa* omitted. It is possible that a haplogy could be used for metre.

⁸⁵ This is a complement by Krause (1952 p. 190 Anm. 1). Thomas completes it as *(lelaKA)şşusa* "showed" which is denied by Schmidt (2001 p. 313 fn. 66) because "coat with blood" is impossible, i.e. a perl. cannot be used with noun. Schmidt translates it as "(befleck)t habend", but this can be confused with absolutive. The form is the past participle f. used as a predicate.

⁸⁶ PK NS 355a1: *p(o)ñ ā[pp](ai)*. Geminated *-ññ* here is written before initial *ā-*.

⁸⁷ *syelme* is *hapax legomenon*, but from the context it would be "sweat". According to Adams (1999 p. 721) it is an obl., but I think that it is a nom., if the predicate is $\sqrt{\text{plät}}$ "hervortreten" as is in Adams, caus.(?), but the form *pletksa* is not attested and dubious whether this verb in pret. III, cf. Krause p. 182 Anm. 1, and he translates it as "he poured out sweat". This would be his own grammar which we cannot trust. On the other hand we can see a part of *LA* (not *ple* at all) and the space of three *akşaras* in the photo. Then I suppose *LAc-neŚ* (pret. 3. sg. of $\sqrt{\text{la}}$ (n)t "hinausgehen").

⁸⁸ *TArraskemane* is *hapax legomenon*, and the meaning is unknown. Krause 1952 p. 247: "mahnen(?) oder beruhigen(?)", TEB II p. 198: "mahnen(?)", TEB I §385 Anm.: "unsicher (< *tärnaskemane*?), falls zu einer Wz. *tär-*, Adams 1999 p. 293 "± plead, implore(?)". Adams (ibid.) presents an etymology (Hittite *tariyanu-* 'entreat' by Melchert), but I cannot find this

m(ñcu)[š](k)eṃ (weŠŠAṃ) larekka śāmna caimP, skente mā [ya]-*
 4 *kṣī mā tve prās(kaT, || brāhma)*⁸⁹ *Oni weskeṃ (mapi oro)ccu walo ṣaṇ pratinmeṃ klau(tkalle*
nesT,) || tumēṃ walo ṣeme ṣarsa u(tta)-
 5 *reṃ mñcuṣkeṃ [e](ñku wace ṣarsa āyo)rs(š)e*⁹⁰ *[w](a)r eñku arañc[ä] st(aukKA)ske[ma]ne*
*mñcuṣkeṃ āyo(rmeṃ brāhmaṇeṃŠ, weŠŠAṃ) || taruṇadi(vākarne) 19/19/10/19*⁹¹ *||*
 6 *MAkte ai(sk)au (uttareṃ ñākte-yoKAṃ Ssuwe)r(š)ke*⁹² *amāskai riye • mā ṣ keś (t)āsau ṣaṇ la(kle) ///*
 <translation>

- 1 She has stained the broad coat with blood (pl. in Toch.), (and) called him with hoarse voice, with love without interrupting. 3 || Then the prince Uttara seized the mother, the queen, with (his) chin (and)
 2 says to her, "Oh my lovely mother, tell (my) father not to give me (← he does not to give me) to those Rākṣasas! || There in(←with) favor of(←in) the prince of the king Araṇemi, from (his) whole body because of (his) suffering
 3 a sweat (came out to him?). He became weak (and) with heart-beating(?) word he says to the prince Uttara, "Oh my darling! Those men are not Yakṣas,
 4 you (need) not be afraid. || Brahmins say, "Well, oh great king! You would keep(← turn back from) your own decision. || Then the king held the prince Uttara with one hand
 5 (and he) held (a container of) water for giving (= Skt. *suvarṇābhiṣeka*?) with the other hand, having given the prince with depressed heart, (he) says to the Brahmins, || in the metre of *taruṇadivākar* ||
 6 How (can) I give (my) little son Uttara (from whom it is) difficult to be separated • and I do not consider (my) own suffering. ...

THT 085v #15

1 *te ṣarṃtsa + + + + + .. rsa*⁹³ *lykaške tāksoyM, śai[š]s(e)ntse mīthy[a] + + + + +*
(wa)[lo] mñcuṣkeṃ brāhmaṇeṃ[ts] (āyormēṃ mi-)
 2 *wamane l[a](klene)*⁹⁴ *(šaMAṃ || tumēṃ brā)hmaṇi uttareṃ mñ(cu)ṣkeṃ [a]ntapi pokainesa*
y[ä](rt)(amane) + + + + + kercīyeṃrṃmeṃ [pa]rna (lateṃ)

meaning, viz. *da-ri-ja-nu-zi* 'er läßt müde werden' (Oettinger 1979 p. 476 fn. 39), and moreover Hittite *tar-* is indger. *d^heh-* 'festsetzen' → 'autoritativ sprechen' (Oettinger ibid. p. 107). It is clear that Adams' etymology does not help Toch. On the other hand, I see on the photo that TA- is not sure, i.e. SA- is also possible. If it is from \sqrt{s} ärp "schlagen (vom Herzen)" (Krause ibid. p. 298) and *rp* → *rr* is possible, it could be "with heart-beating word", but it is not certain either. I think that it is better to leave it as pending.

⁸⁹ After PK NS 355a2.

⁹⁰ PK NS 355a3: *wace ṣarsa ysāśše (war)*. About *war* "water" here, see Couvreur 1964 p. 240, fn. 13, viz. Skt. *suvarṇābhiṣeka* and *saratnam arghyam*.

⁹¹ Schmidt emends the number of syllables 20/22/10/15 which is given in Sieg/Siegling 1953 p. 23 fn. 5., Thomas 1983 p. 108, 239 f. and 252. It is not sure about the syllable number because of incompleteness of the verse. If Thomas 1983 p. 240 "Der erste Fünfter ist nämlich um 1 Silbe zu kurz" is not right, it is 19 syllables for the first *pāda*, i.e. not 5/5/5/5, but 7/7/5. I suppose that Schmidt's emendation is right as in Adams 1999 p. 828.

⁹² After PK NS 355a4.

⁹³ Schmidt denies (2001 p. 314 fn. 74) Sieg/Siegling's complement (*ṣaṇ ṣa)rsa* (1953 p. 23 fn. 7) from the photo. I recognize *.TA* before *rsa* and found a possibility of THT 228r1 *āsTArSa* "with (Māra's) weapon" (cf. Adams 1999 p. 59 quoting Couvreur 1964 p. 246 fn. 55 "uit Skr. *astrā*; niet «das Reine» *astare* TEB II, 168!). This could be suitable if \sqrt{t} āks means "to smash" (cf. Schmidt 2001 p. 314 fn. 75), I would take it.

⁹⁴ After PK NS 355b2.

3 *tane uttare (enerSAñK)⁹⁵ ○lkāskemane + + + nañ tRAntācce KAntwāśkesa + + + + + mane*
weṢṢAñ saswa appa[kk](a ma)-
 4 *pi psāmpar ñ[iś(‘)] (cenāñ rā)[kṣ](a)⁹⁶ ○tsenmeñ lok[e] ykāk tv(e) śāmane nesT^{*} ñake ñke c[ai]*
ñ(i)ś PA(sT, śu)wañ⁹⁷ || te keklyau<ṣo>rmeñ arañemiñ lā-
 5 *nte pit maiwātene k(ē)tsa klāya⁹⁸ • tane orotṣa kwasalñeṣṣa weśeñña klyauṣāte || tane ñake*
brā[h](ma)ñi uttareñ MAñcuṣkeñ ścirona rekauna-
 6 *sa SKArrāmane⁹⁹ weskeñne paṣ paṢ, KArpīye<ñ>tS, soṃśka wesañ, ñake ṣarnene kekamu*
nesT, mā ṣ pātRA (lkā)lle nesT, || tumēñ brāhmañi tott i
 <translation>

- 1 With this cause ... with the weapon(?) I will smash(?) the falsity of the world (in) small (pieces)
 ... The king, having given the prince to Brahmins,
 2 sits trembling in suffering. || Then Brahmins, while they tugged the prince Uttara with both hands,
 went out from the palace.
 3 There Uttara, looking ... in vain, says with hoarse voice(← small tongue) ... , "Oh my
 glorious(←load) father,
 4 really take me away far from these Rākṣasas! Still you are living, but now they will eat me away.
 || Having heard it, the bile of the king Arañemi
 5 quaked (and) fell down on the ground. • There a big lamenting voice was heard. || There now the
 Brahmins, while they scold the prince Uttara with hard words,
 6 speak to him, "Go, go, oh vulgar boy! You have come now in our hands, and cannot see (your)
 father. || Then Brahmins, meanwhile ...

THT 086r (T III MQ23.6, Pencil-number 2543)

- 1 /// PAS, śuwañ pt(āka saiM,.) waste • /// (= THT 85v4)
 2 /// kentsa klāya || tane orotse kwasalñe[ṣ]ṣe /// (= THT 85v5)
 3 /// (utta)[r](e)[m] mcuṣkeñ ścirona rekaunasa SKArrāmane weskeñ /// (= THT 85v5)
 4 /// mañiye neS, mā ṢP, pāTAR, lkālṇe neS*¹⁰⁰ || /// (= THT 85v6)
 5 /// (a)rañemiñ lānte ypoytse salyai lyutstsante ///

⁹⁵ PK NS 355b3: MA[ñ](c)uṣke enerSAñK, but judging from the space in the photo (THT 085), it should be enerSAñK, alone (without MAñcuṣke).

⁹⁶ PK NS 355b4: [ce]ññi(N)^ñ(.) rāk[ṣ]at(s)e(nmeñ).

⁹⁷ Schmidt (2001 p. 315) adds "Sei [du mir] (Schutz) [und] Zuflucht!" from THT 086a1, but here there is no space. It is better to show this sentence in fn. in order to recognize the real writing. These two folios are not written by the same writers because of different style of handwriting and as well as different spelling, i.e. nesT : neS, ṣ : ṢP, ṣarnene kekamu : mañiye. Writing styles changed even in the same place whithin a short time, i.e. there is no synchronic and diachronic difference.

⁹⁸ The same description is seen on THT 087bav3 which we cannot determine its location. Presumably an expression like this is common in Toch. for the sake of making scenes dramatic.

⁹⁹ -rr- in this word is an assimilation of -rn- (pres. class VI, suffix -nā-). Later I will discuss a problem of rr within palaeography (in Appendix).

¹⁰⁰ The word and spelling in this line differ from THT 085v6 as written above. From neS* (virāma comma before danḍa) for nesT, (/t/ is omitted on phonetic ground), and "to our hand come" vs. "slave", it is possible that THT 086 is younger than THT 085 because of phonetic and semantic reason. Moreover, I see a younger scripts (a little awkward square shape) in THT 086.

<translation>

1 ~ 4: the same as THT 085v4 ~ 6.

5 /// they went across the border of the king Araṇemi's country ...

THT 086v

1 /// .. *te uttareṃ mēcuṣkeṃ śauśAṃ lāre soṃśka uttara* [•] ///

2 /// .. *koynameṃ reki klyauṣiM* || *ate takāsta*[ñ]_ ///

3 /// (*ta*)[ñ]() *KAl̥ymin̥ sportoTAR* _ *mā Ś* _ *tañ* _ *koynameṃ lare* ///

4 /// (|| *chandra*)*kanivartan̥ne* (4x12) || *ñiśmeṃ tsrorsa larepi soṃśke(ntse)* ///

5 /// *lñeṣṣe PArmaṇsa* + + + *TAr nai la* ///

<translation>

1 /// he calls the prince Uttara, "Oh my loving son, Uttara! ...

2 /// from (your) mouth I want to hear a word. || You were far away from(←of) me ...

3 /// your ... he turns around (in all) directions, and not from (your) mouth a lovely ...

4 /// || in the metre of *chandrakanivart* || With separation from me, of loving son ...

5 /// with hope of ... (he) ... indeed ...

THT 087r (T III Š96.18, Pencil-number 2233)

1-2 {missing}

3 + + (*t*). ///

4 .. + *śśAṃ* || /// (= THT 086v4 before the name of the metre?)

5 *ṣṣe PArmaṇsa* /// (= THT 086v5)

6 + .*ā* [*k*].*ne* • *klau*[*tk*]. ///

<translation>

6 /// in ... • (he) turned back ...

THT 087v #20 (T III Š101, Pencil-number 2233)

1 *ñ[k]e mā kalla[m]* • *tso(ñk)*[*ai*](*K*_) ///

2 *brāhmaṇe* .. ///

3 [*w*]*e* + .. [*t*].*e* ///

4 {only one trace}

5, 6 {missing}

<translation>

1 now he will not gain ... • In the morning ...

2 The Brahman ...

3 ~ 6 impossible to read

THT 088r (T III Š75.3, Pencil-number 2339, the center in normal), The left side is THT 1924 (T III Š731, in ***bold italics***), the right side is THT 073ba (in ***bold***). Judging from the folio number 21, THT 088 follows THT 087 directly.

- 1 (ka)ntwo koynamem parna¹⁰¹ lnaṣṣi(ne | tu)mem durmukhe brāhmaṇe uttare<ṇ> śamaśkem
 KARwāṣṣai witsakaisa RAskare tsoṇaṇne siñcai ṣorpor i[n]e¹⁰² ++ +
 2 mormem au«ntsa»ntene ścīre maKastsi • | tane ṇake uttari śamaś(k)entse kālpsa¹⁰³ painemem
 ette kloyomane alyeKA kca warttoṣṣe makūlsa tatrāppa-
 3 rmem r[ū]psa¹⁰⁴ klāya MArṣāne¹⁰⁵ keOne mrakwe yopsane || tane rudraśarme brāhmaṇe {•}
 portsaisa¹⁰⁶ ut[ta](r)e(ṇ mñcu)ṣkem eṇkormem tsak[a]tsai
 4 kemtsa orKAntai yārttane | <tu> ○ lyelyakormem vrkṣavāsike ṇakte śle māṇt{s}alyṇe śanoś
 weṢṢAṇ lariya pāl[k]a nai mā ṣekamñe
 5 wāntarwatS, sparkālye (āke |) [pa]ñcagatine (21/21/18/13) || ykāk cwi śamāne pācer wlo
 vip(←ṣ)ṇuntamts¹⁰⁷ ra amāskai yāmtsi sū erkatte • (ya)k no cwi somśke<m> lalam-
 6 ṣkem aināki caimP*, brā(hmaṇi yā)r(tt)e(nn)e¹⁰⁸ śle tremem : pil(k)o(sā)ñmālaṣkem lkāṢṢAnme
 taṇsa saM, mñcuṣ[k]e lareṇ pāTAr ramT, : mā (wa)¹⁰⁹ ks[a]Ṣ*, cwim[P.]

¹⁰¹ -rma- is preserved. We can find -nn- in younger texts, e.g. THT 331r (T II S57.1), THT 525r (T II S67.7), THT 598a (T III M143.13), THT 599r (T III M135.10).

¹⁰² i[t]e is a transliteration in Thomas 1953 p. 25 and Adams 1999 p. 663, which is made by Sieg/Siegling, but on the photo in[e] is sure to be read, and the following two akṣaras could be ś. and .k., then I agree with K.T. Schmidt's reading (2001 p. 316 fn. 94) ine[ś] (eṇṣ)[k](e yā)mormem. However, a translation is because of the previous two words siñcai ṣorpor quite uncertain. Adams: "having filled the sincai bag with water"; K.T. Schmidt: "Nachdem sie eine ... Kapuze(?) bis in [seine] Au(gen gez)ogen(?) hatten". Schmidt's translation is much better, but yneś eṇṣke yāmormem "bis in Augen gezogen" is dubious. If Schmidt's transcription is right, I would like to translate it as "having even made clear (← ineś yām-)", but sincai and ṣorpor (including another ṣo(rpo) M.3b7 in Filliozat 1948 p. 95) are unknown. Judging from the context, it could mean "hard work" or "heavy burden" for the prince Uttara. A mistake is always thinkable for hapax legomena, but I dare to find possibilities: ṣorpor would be a verbal noun from pret. stem ṣor- which could be from √sārp "to beat" (palatal ś and apophony ā → o for pret. stem). sincai would be an obl., which functions as object of verbal noun. If sincai means "back", it would be suitable to the context. I would like to offer a hypothesis in my translation.

¹⁰³ kālpa (Skt. kalpa) is difficult to understand. TEB II p. 180: "Verhalten", Adams 1999 p. 155: "age", Edgerton 1953 p. 172: "manner". "Verhalten" is used by Schmidt (2001 p. 316) with (?), "age" is not apt. I prefer to take "manner" (close to "Verhalten").

¹⁰⁴ r[ū]p is Skt. rūpa "(beatiful) shape" as is in TEB II p. 232. Schmidt translates it as "Gesicht" (2001 p. 317) which comes presumably from rupaśke "Gesicht" (TEB II p.232). In my opinion "Gesicht" für rupaśke would also be a mistake (cf. fn. 80 above).

¹⁰⁵ Schmidt emends it as PArṣāte "he/she/it sprinkled" and translates this passage as "spritzte da jetzt Hirn auf die Erde [und] drang in sie ein". If this is right, Uttara died. I suppose that MArṣāne is not a mistake, but kene should be emended as kemne or kenne "in the earth" as in Schmidt, and mrakwe "small portion (of knee) = kneecap?", because the prince fell on the knee. Anyway, my translation is tentative.

¹⁰⁶ portsai is hapax legomenon, and its meaning is unknown, only the obl. form is recognizable. Schmidt 2001 p. 317: "Gürtel (?)", Adams 1999 p. 404: *porsno (sic!) "ankle". Another possibility is a mistake for pokai "arm", because rts and k are a little similar, and we can see mistaken ts for t in next line māṇt{s}alyṇe, which (without s) is suitable for the context, but is also not sure because of hapax. This folio is somehow difficult to understand, e.g. "•" before portsai or forgotten <tu> in the next line. This could mean that the writer's ability was not enough to write correctly, though the scripts are fine to read.

¹⁰⁷ The form is gen. pl., but there are not many Viṣṇus, because he is just one god. I suppose that Viṣṇu is a representative of two gods and three saints (二天・三仙 cf. Nakamura 1981 p. 1049), two gods are Maheśvara and Viṣṇu, and three saints are Kapila, Kaṇāda and Rṣabha (founder of schools).

¹⁰⁸ (yā)r(tt)e(nn)e is not (yā)rte(nn)e as in Sieg/Siegling 1953 p. 25, because -[t]- is written on another paper, but there is enough space for tt below r. Instead, -nn- is visible, but not sure.

¹⁰⁹ w[a] is mentioned in Sieg/Siegling 1953 p. 25, but on the photo, w- seems to be on another piece as is in r6/v1 of this folio, because there is a remnant of akṣara on the left of w-, which has nothing to do with the original one, and the back side of this part differs from the piece of w-. Another example cited in TEB II p. 238 mā wa nnaī is mā wat nai. A combination with indefinitum /ksā/ "some" and /ṣāp/ "and" is not attested. Moreover, I cannot understand mā wa ksa ṣ because of two different conjunctions /wā/ "but" and /ṣāp/ "and" in such a short passage. Schmidt's translation "und nicht ist auch nur irgendeiner" (2001 p. 317) is also difficult to understand. Presumably, another possibility is better, e.g. /preksā/ "he questioned", /rāksā/ "he covered" or /weksā/ "with voice", which might mean "nothing to say", but it is also not sure.

<translation>

- 1 The tongue went out from his mouth || Then the Brahmin Durmukha pokes the little boy Uttara violently with root of reed, having (even made clear), beating (his) back (with root of reed ??),
- 2 they began to make him run hard. • || There now with a manner of the little boy Uttara he stumbled on(←with) some another root in(←of) forest and crashed down on his knee (←from two feet),
- 3 he fell down with (his whole) body. (The prince) forgot him(← fell in a faint?), (and) small piece (= kneecap?) entered in the earth(?) || There the Brahmin Rudraśarma, having seized the prince Uttara with (his) arm(?), tugged him through thorny
- 4 earth back and forth. || Having seen it The god Vṛkṣavāsika¹¹⁰ says to (his) wife with injured (feeling), "Oh my darling, look the instability
- 5 of things (and) the transitory end!" || in the metre of *pañcagati* || Still his father, the king, (is) alive(←living). Even for Viṣṇu and so on, (it is) difficult to do, he is unfriendly. • Yet those greedy Brahmins tugged his tender son
- 6 with anger. : With pitying view, that prince sees them with love as if (he sees his) lovely father. : Nothing to say (?) that person's

THT 088v #21

- 1 **M**AsketRA waste comP, [l](aklene 1 KAlymiṃ) [s]po«rto»tRA pācer cwi[mP,] (ku)rār lūwo [tu]-yāknes(a) kw[ä]snātRA snai [KAR]st[o] • kwāTArne taṃsa śauśaṃne cwī
- 2 ykuwa tom ykentane wolo(ktRA te) mw[e]nte¹¹¹ <•> lwāsāts ra SPA seniK,¹¹² comP, kaLPAṢṢAṃ ṇśameṃ wātkoṣ kr,i lkācer nī so(m)ske : p[ts]ārwaṣṣatne nī yke-
- 3 ne ytārin empelyai 2 | ś(a)na nākteñña weṢṢAṃ makte pācer walo cwi comP, lakle śala kā SPA [ñ](ake LA)klesu ste | vṛkṣa-
- 4 vāsike nākte weṢṢAṃ pa○ñāKTAṃñe perneṣṣe akālksa rinsātene mā traiko¹¹³ yamasne [pi/o] + + k LAkleñ, arañce ni-
- 5 ttaṃ weSAñ no pernesa sū tom LAklenta lkāṢṢAṃ || te weweñ(o)rmeṃ ItaiS, ñaktene || om no ñake tott ike postam yne[ma]ne brāhmaṇi uttareṃ
- 6 [mñ]c[u]ṣkeṃ ākemane candram(u)khi lānte yapoyne klāntene • tumēṃ brāhmaṇagrāmne

¹¹⁰ *vṛkṣavāsike* is a Skt. name in Toch. nom. sg. as is in Adams 1999 p. 572, but Schmidt 2001 p. 317: "ein baumbewohnender Gott". I cannot find this name in Akanuma 1931, so it is possible that this name was created in Toch. or loaned from some another literature.

¹¹¹ *mw[e]nte* is problematic. TEB II p. 52: *mw ente* "wenn ..." (fn. 9 -mw (← -mu) "traurig?" in one syllable). Schmidt 2001 p. 317 fn. 100: (*tu-* or *te-*)*maṇṇte* "von (da) an". On the photo *wa* is pale in comparison with upper *m*, but *m* on *m* is on another paper, therefore, this would be *mante* without *w*. Then *ente* is a fault as Schmidt claims (ibid.), and a conj. "wenn" comes not in the end of sentences even in verses. Moreover, two-syllable-words with *mu* does not exist. And also, I cannot accept Schmidt's notion because *mante* originally "upwards" Skt. *ūrdhvam* and used as postposition "von ... ab" (TEB II p. 218), and *te-mante* is not attested. My hypothesis: this word was written *se-mwante* for *se-mant* "in this way" ("*tālis*" in TEB II p. 218), i.e. in such a way of crying and screaming as is mentioned before, or *te-mant* "so". Anyway, it is better not to translate the words here.

¹¹² The meaning of /senik/ is not easy. TEB II p. 257: "Auftrag", Adams 1999 p. 699: (adv.)! "under one's care", Schmidt 2001 p. 319-320: "anvertraut, in Obhut". I am not sure whether an etymology of this word is Avestan *zaēna* "watching over" (Khot. *ysnī(ya)*, Sogd. *zynyh*, Kroraina *jhenīga* cf. Adamas ibid.) because of -k in Toch., but from context, I take "trust" as an object of *kaLPAṢṢAṃ* "he gains" tentatively.

¹¹³ *yamas* is an impv. 2. pl. act. with the ending -s, without impv. prefix *p-*, which is irregular. Normally before *p-* the impv. prefix could be omitted (*p-p* → *p*) and the pl. form for his wife is not understandable because *pluralis majestatis* was not attested in Toch. It could be a mistake for *pyāmtsar* (impv. 2. sg. mid.).

yaipormem akaLṢAlyi rudramukhem purohitem [w]e(ñ)[ā]

<translation>

- 1 protection is located in that suffering. 1 || The father of that (person) turned around (in all directions). A bird(←animal), sea eagle, laments in(←with) such a way (as his father?) without interrupting. • He calls him with love, screams(←calls) at him.
- 2 He stays in the places (where) his (son) went (in such a manner = in screaming?) • and also he feels(←gets) the(←that) trust in(←of) birds(←animals), (and in his mind) "If you may see my son (who is) separated from me, instead of me (← in my place), (please) comfort him (who is) in dreadful way!" 2 || (His) wife, the goddess says, "The father, the king himself has brought that suffering for him. Why also now is he unhappy?" || Vṛkṣavāsika,
- 4 the king says, "With (his) desire of the Buddha-worth he has given up him(= the prince). Don't give(←make) him a fault(←sin)! ... from suffering he breaks (his) heart.
- 5 Now because of us (←with our worth) he sees the sufferings. || Having said it, both gods went out. || There now the Brahmins, going step for step (and) leading the prince Uttara,
- 6 brought him to(←in) the country of the king Candramukha. • Then having entered into Brāhmaṇagrāma(= village of Brahmin) they said to the teacher Rudramukha,

THT 089r (T III Š64.15, Pencil-number 2328)

- 1 (?klaw)tkac perne poyšĩññe ket pernesa snai tRAnko ñiś rinsatai : kṣatriññempa ā[k]lu ñiŚ, sakne aukṣu LAkle ///
- 2 nraiṣṣana tom LAklenta yśāmna lk[ā]skau : waipṭāR, wloṢAṃ letsemne po KAlymĩntsa lwāsa ñi lestai yāmwa¹¹⁴ : ///
- 3 ñi inkaum KAstweR, 2 laOreñ, + [ñ]i¹¹⁵ onolmi lkoycer nai ñi tallārñe erka ///
- 4 triku yam warttone : kemtsa ○ [t.] + + + + (+) k[o]tsts[e]m̃ts¹¹⁶ [p]arwa tat(w)āñ[k]au mā ketrā[ññe]¹¹⁷ (:) ///
- 5 sasw appakka 3 || tumem uttar(e) mñicuṣke [na] + + + + + .. e[pi]ya + + + + [n]. ram (n)o .. ///
- 6 [yau]¹¹⁸ taur āp(←ṣ)tsa¹¹⁹ KA(māman)e¹²⁰ weṢṢAṃ || bharyaci[n](tākne) (4x12) ///

¹¹⁴ This *pāda* c is a little difficult to understand, i.e. to which word, *letsem* "locks, hair" or *lestai* "nest", *ñi* "my" relates. Thomas 1983 p. 243: "in [ihren; scil. der Tiere] auseinandergeschlagenen Haaren gewährten mir die Tiere überall Unterkunft" (because of pl. *letsem* with pl. *luwāsa* "animals"?). against Couvreur's "in [mijn] verwarde haarlokken". Schmidt follows Thomas with quotation in fn. 108 (2001 p. 318). From context I prefer Couvreur's because the prince alone gets suffering on his head where many animals (= metaphor for sufferings?) make their nests, not the prince's nest in many animals, though *ñi* is written separately (*metri causa*).

¹¹⁵ On the photo, *ñ* can be recognized. If this is *ñi* "my", the word before *ñi* is in one syllable from the number of syllables (7/4/7), and it could be a conjunction *no* "now" or *šāp* "and" in a sence of emphasis like the next passage *lkoycer nai ñi*.

¹¹⁶ *k[o]tsts[e]m̃ts* is *hapax legomenon* and the meaning is unknown. Schmidt 2001 p. 318: "in Eulen(?)federn gezwängt". An adj. with -tstse is thinkable, e.g. *palskotstse* "having thought" or *pilkotstse* "having a view", but *k-* is clear (not ligature) on the photo. *tstsai* instead of *tstse* is possible to see and *ko* could be *kau*. If it is *kautstsai* which could be a scribal error for *kautātstsai* (obl.) "breakable" from \sqrt{kaut} "to split off" (cf. Adams 1999 p. 210, the nom. **kautātstse* should be **kautātstse*), and *kautātstsai* is not an adj. as is in Adams, because the obl. and gen. of *tstse*-adj. is -cce. The reading is sure (Lévi 1933 p. 61, S (5) a3; Thomas 1966 p. 172, S 5 Vorderseite 3), so this word is a noun in gen. pl. and its meaning could be "poor clothes" like BHS *pāṃśu-kāla*, but it is not sure because of the next *[p]arwa* "feathers".

¹¹⁷ *mā ketrā[ññe]* is *hapax legomenon* and not easy to understand. Thomas (1985 p. 243): "niemandem angehörig", which Schmidt follows (2001 p. 318), citing *cwiññe* "ihm gehörig" etc. I doubt whether this part including the previous one was written correctly. Tentatively I follow Thomas' opinion.

¹¹⁸ This *akṣara* *yau* could be written on another paper. Both *y-* and *-au* are in different form, so Schmidt's supposition *kaklāyau* "(gefal)len" (2001 p. 319) would be incorrect.

<translation>

- 1 ... (?became to) your worth of All-knowing(= Buddha), with its(←whose) worth you have left me (though I have) no sin. : I have studied with (people) of Kṣatriya happily(←in happiness), (but) a suffering (is) increased ///
- 2 I see the sufferings of hell in human life (← among men). : In my confused(← attacked differently) hairs all over, animals have made (their own) nest. : ///
- 3 for me(?) day and night. 2 (verse number without ||) My loving beings! You might see even my misery (and) anger ///
- 4 confusedly(←confused) I go into the forest. : On the earth ... worn(?) feathers of *k[o]tsts[e]*, (and I am) belonging to nobody(?). : ///
- 5 Oh my lord, father!" 3 || Then the prince Uttara ... remembering(?) ... as if ///
- 6 ... strewing ash(← dust) on his head, he says. || in the metre of *bharyacintāka* ///

THT 089v #23

- 1 (e)kitatse śauly ñe + + + .n. • śaul onkipṣu [k]. ///
- 2 snai saim waste : yāmor ñakta¹²¹ kā tot ñisne maiyya (lkā)st(a)R¹²² (:) + + + .s. ye + + + + + s[a]ññ[ā]T_ ///
- 3 lkātsi : ñi sak lakle [t](a)ñ wa○[še]¹²³ tu [p]āke yā(m)u (: ya)k no ñiś, ñke erk(a)tñettse lye[l](k)[w] e ///
- 4 (la)klene 3 || tane ñake āru○ñāvatiṣṣi KAr(yo)r tt(a)ñc, uttari mñcuṣkeṇtse tRAñkalyñe [re](ki) ///
- 5 k_{se} nai tamP, añmālaṣke palwaṇ SAsweṇtse araṇemiñ lānte SPA ñeM, śauśAṃ || dravyaśvare KAr(yo)r tt(au) /// (Laklesso)-

¹¹⁹ *āṣṭsa* is a perl. of *āśce* "head", which shows three fricatives (or sibilants), i.e. *āstīm* obl. pl., *āśce* nom. sg., *āści* nom. pl. and *āṣṭsa* perl. sg. /s/ can be seen (12 times in THT 001–633), but /ś/ is mostly written (205 times *ibid.*), so /s/ could be a mistake. These are all Toch. phoneme inventories /s, ś, ṣ/, and the reason why three phonemes come together for one word is presumably based on *Phonotaktik* (phoneme combination), i.e. /s/-t/, /ś/-c/ and /ṣ/-ts/. Phonetic interpretation for /ś/ is a little difficult, but from palatal opposition of /k/, it could be [ç] (palatal fricative), which I discussed with Pinault, while /ṣ/ is [ʃ] (postalveolar fricative, palatal opposition of /s/). I suppose that the original form was /āst/, and nom. sg. -e made *t* → *c*, *c* made *s* → *ś* (obl. is minus -e, nom. pl. is obl. plus -i), and perl. sg. *āst-sa* → *āṣ-tsa*. Apropos, *aṣṭsa* = BHS -*śira*- (251a5) in Adams 1999 p. 56 is not correct because Skt. instrumental case is *śirasā*.

¹²⁰ Cf. Schmidt 1974 p. 353 and 2001 p. 319 fn. 109; Thomas 1985 p. 243. Other similar examples are in PK NS 36 Aa5 and PK NS Ca5.

¹²¹ *yāmor ñakta* (voc.) could be a compound (cf. Thomas 1983 p. 243), but can be separated as *pratyāika- ra -pudñākte* (cf. Bernhard 1958 p. 48), viz. not real compound as in Skt., and *ñakte* is added to Skt. words showing respected nuance, e.g. B-Toch. *pud-ñākte* "Buddha-God = Buddha" or A-Toch. *wlā-ñKA* "King-God = Skt. *devendra* = Indra" (cf. Bernhard, *ibid.* p. 49). *yāmor* "deed" could be translated from Skt. *karman*, but there is not such a god in India. I suppose a BHS *karmakāraka* "presiding officer in assembly" (cf. Edgerton 1953 p. 170) or Chin. 業道神 "gods who observe the people's right and wrong deed" (cf. Nakamura 1981 p. 408). I prefer the latter because of the context.

¹²² The passage is difficult to translate because of this verb. Schmidt 1974 p. 460: "warum (zeig)st du so sehr [deine] Macht an mir?", and in fn. 2 (*ibid.*): "Die von Sieg/Siegling in den Text gesetzte Ergänzung ... (lkā)st(a)r hat keine kausative Bedeutung (Kaus. würde *lakāstar)". Thomas (1983 p. 243) follows Schmidt's opinion, but he thinks 3. sg. passive *lkāstār*, "warum wird [deine] Macht so [sehr] an mir gesehen?". I suppose that both are not right because there is space only for one *aṣṭsa* before -st-, i.e. **lakāstar* is impossible, and after voc. of 2. sg., normally the predicate of 2. sg. comes. However, I wonder which power *yāmor-ñakte* possesses. My opinion: *lkāstar* is not wrong if *yāmor-ñakte* observes the people's right and wrong deed, as is the previous fn., and *maiyya* "might" is a metaphor for "wrong deed". Other possibilities are *rustar* "you open" or *klāstar* "you lead", but *lkāstar* is better from the context. Apropos, *palkaṣṭār*, 92a4 (my transliteration: *PALKAṣṭār*) in Thomas (*ibid.*) is not from √lāk "sehen", but √pāl "quälen, skt. *tāpayati*" (TEB II p. 209) because pres. caus. 2. sg. of √lāk is *lākṣtār*.

¹²³ In the photo I can recognize this word as *waṣe* but the meaning "lie" is not suitable. Schmidt translates it as "Bereich" (*mūṣe?*), but I also cannot understand well. Tentatively, I take "lie" though the relation or context is not clear.

6 nt¹²⁴ onolme || maṇiśvare KAr̥yaur̥tto weṢṢAṃ lalaṃṣke kṣā samP, weK, klyauṣtRA mā tāmP, nta
ykāka śaumoṃntse ///

<translation>

1 helpful(?), a life ... • a life, oh shameless man! ...

2 without support (and) refuge(←house). || Oh my Karma(-observing) god! Why do you
observe(←see) my(←in me) might in such a way? : ... restrained ///

3 to see. : My happiness and misery, and your lie(?), it (is) separated, : furthermore now I saw ...
of anger. ///

4 in misery 3 || There now merchants of Aruṇāvati (heard?) the lament (and word) ...

5 "Who complains so pitifully and calls the name of the lord, the king Araṇemi?" || The merchant
Dravyaśvara (says) ///

6 (unhappy) being. || The merchant Maṇiśvara says, "Some soft voice is heard. (I have) never
(heard) such (a voice) of human being. ///

THT 090r (T III Š93.14,)¹²⁵

1 /// tatwāṅkau¹²⁶ tapovam varttoś ya¹²⁷

2 /// [KA]ry. .t. ñc[] alloKA kca¹²⁸ stānasa ā

3 /// (ta)llāw ram no [ā]rw[a] KAr̥snāmane ścireNAṃ

4 /// yane aruṇ[ā]vati riś, sorromP, ka

5 /// [k]. yoK¹²⁹ ente nai kca nesta ñke ñissa

¹²⁴ Obl. sg. m. of /lākle-ssu/ "unhappy".

¹²⁵ According to Schmidt (2001 p. 319), there are 18 folios between No. 89 and 91. No. 90 which does not follow directly to No. 89, and also Uig. version, Mz 223 belong to the gap. The king Araṇemi gave not only his son and wife but also himself. The oppression against the king Araṇemi in Mz 223 is similar to that of prince Uttara. I will shortly present the story from the German translation of Zieme (2001 p. 420): The king was tormented on the dirty ground, sometimes stamped on his face, but he showed mild eyes like a lotus to the Brahmin Rudramukha. The king was happy, though he was tormented, because he completed the *kṣānti-pāramitā*. Then, Brahmin's wife asked not to torment him but to sell him. The king, wearing clothes of the poor, was taken to Caṇḍāla-gate where somebody with a sword in his hand asked the Brahmin whether the king could be sold.

¹²⁶ This is a p.p. from *√twāṅ*, which appears only here and in THT 089r4. In A-Toch. we can find *twāṅkatr aśśuK*, THT 815r3 and p.p. *kārKAr̥yāsi wsāl tā[t]wā- 707r3* and *tā[t]wāṅku [s]āma[ñ]i 771r6*. The meaning is "einzwängen(?)" (Krause 1952 p. 252), "einzwängen" (TEB p. 108, p. 201) and "± wear (or 'don' or 'doff?)" (Adams 1999 p. 322). I cannot understand why TEB mentions it without (?). Despite poor fragments, I prefer "to wear" (not "doff"), because of B-*parwa* "feathers" and A- *wsāl* "clothing", especially Uig. description "ein sehr schlechtes, einem Sklaven passendes schäbiges Gewand anziehen" (Zieme 2001 p. 420).

¹²⁷ Schmidt 2001 p. 320: "geht er"; Adams 1999 p. 322: "[lege: yaṃ?] he goes". Both are pres. 3. sg. from *√i* "to go", but in this folio *anusvāra* is written correctly, and beginning with *ya-* is ger. and inf. of *√i*. Another possibility is *yaPAṢṢAṃ* caus. pres. 3. sg. from *√yāp* "to enter".

¹²⁸ *kca* is obl. of indefinitum *ksa* with nuance "some", but here obl. pl. f. *alloKA*(← *alloṅkna*) "others" which is related to perl. pl. f. (alternate) *stāna-sa* is already indefinite. Schmidt translates *alloKA kca* as "irgendwo (?)" (2001 p. 320). The combination *ksa/kca* is presumably an analogy with *k_sse/k_sce* "who", but gen. *ket(-ra)* cannot be interpreted, and *ksa* is neither "Indefinitpronomen" in TEB I p. 166 nor pronominal adj. in Adams 1999 p. 242, but a particle because it could not stand alone. There are some interpretations about this problem, but I can accept/understand none of them, e.g. **kwāixé kwāixé > B kuse ksa* (Catt's attempt for *kāikse* THT 197v5). I would rather not translate *ksa*, when *ksa* has semantically or even grammatically nothing to do for the context, especially in the case of verses, though there might have been some meaning or function originally.

¹²⁹ Thomas completed it as (*lare*)-*yoK*, "lovelike" (Adams 1999 p. 548) which appears in THT 072r2 and 093v5, but on the photo [k]. is visible. It is recognized by Schmidt (2001 p. 320), but he mistakes it for (*aina*)*k(e)*-*lare* for -*yoK*, "Aussehender" which I cannot understand. *yoK* means "color" or "hair", which is not suitable here. I leave it as pending.

6 /// [wa]rtto¹³⁰ ynema[ne] reskeñ` ysāra : a

<translation>

1 /// worn(?) he(= Brahmin?) make him(= the king?) enter Tapovana woods

2 /// marchants ... with other trees ...

3 /// like misery ... hard woods cutting

4 /// (he led?) him to the city Arṇāvati, downward

5 /// ... where you were, now with me

6 /// while he goes to the woods, his blood (pl.) flows : ...

THT 090v

1 /// (me)[ñ ra]mT*¹³¹ ścīri(n)[n](e) • taññe cau yaitko(rsa?)

2 /// [m]. lāntne¹³² maiyyācce weR* epiyac

3 /// [pru]kormem¹³³ i[s](ta)K* traikane¹³⁴ || tumem

4 /// || śle tremem (brā)hmaṇe weṢṢAṇ hai ma(niśvara)

5 /// (r)[e]kau[na] kauṇ parki aksaune mā śwātsi

6 /// .. t. sne wāspinnau(←wawārpau??) yan nai

<translation>

1 /// like (moon in) stars. • (With?) this order of you

2 /// (having) remember(ed) a strong hate in king (Araṇemi?)

3 /// having jumped, immediately (Bracman?) confused him(= the king)

4 /// || Brahmin says with anger, "Hey Ma(niśvara)!"

5 /// I will proclaim the words to him (at) sunrise, "No food

6 /// ... to him / in ... surrounded(??) he goes surely (??)

THT 091r (T III Š91.25 & 91.26)

1 (ā)ntsesa watsālai premane war āṣtsis¹³⁵ yakne yamaṢAṇ satyakār [a] ///

¹³⁰ wartto (obl.) might be warttone (loc.) because of \sqrt{i} "to go" (cf. examples in Adams 1999 p. 580), but -ne is omitted metri causa. Toch. obl. is not an accusative in the sense of indger., i.e. no function of "Akkusativ der Richtung". The obl. is a key factor in Toch., so Toch. could be the oblique language.

¹³¹ (me)[ñ ra]mT* is a complement of Thomas (1983 p. 244), but meñ is obl. of meñe "moon". It might be metri causa or nom. -e was added to meñ, i.e. meñ was original. I prefer the latter because of meñ-yok "moon-color" or meñ-ñäkte "moon-god", if a quasi compound in Toch. (against the Skt. compound) was not composed with obl. in previous member. Another possibility is that -e was omitted like a syncope of ä, when a closely related word came next to meñe (not a compound).

¹³² lāntne is corrected from lāntwe.

¹³³ [pru]kormem is Schmidt's complement (2001 p. 320). On the photo I can recognize it.

¹³⁴ According to Schmidt (2001 p. 320 fn. 121) this verb means "ohnmächtig werden" because of two examples in A-Toch. 56a4 and 77b1f. (Schmidt 1974 p. 124), but these two are combined with tkañā (klā) "(fel) on the earth". I suppose "confused" → "powerless" → "fell on earth". I prefer to take its meaning as "to confuse" (caus. of \sqrt{trik} "to be confused") as is in Krause 1952 p. 251.

¹³⁵ Schmidt 2001 p. 321: "verhält er sich wie ein Wasserträger", but the infinitive in allative āṣtsis is not explained. I think that this āṣtsis is relating to watsālai premane, "carrying watsāla on the shoulder in order to bring water". Similar usage of yakne is in THT 019v3 nestisśca yakne aiṢṢAṇ "... zu sein, gibt er die Weise" (Sieg/Siegling 1949 p. 31). Then watsāla is a tool on the shoulder for carrying water. It could be Schmidt's "Schlauch" (made from animal's skin?) or a balance-bar hanging water-tubs tied with rope at both ends, which is used in China and Japan. I prefer the latter because of "on the shoulder". If it is right, a gardener can easily water with it.

2 warpor še mai klātsāT*¹³⁶ () araṇemi weṢṢAṇ tañ yai[tk]o(rne kl)y(e)ñca nes[au] sa ///
 3 (ke)r(c)iyenne pāsa || om no ñake [a](ra)ṇemi werpiśkatse ///
 4 + + te || [t]e mañt yaknesa (cwi) [lañtu]ññeṣṣepi¹³⁷ rṣāke(ntse) ///
 5 + + l(w)āsasa lkāṣṣi cwi perne[sa] + + + po stāna ñākci ///
 6 + + [śa]ñoś weṢṢAṇ ṣarya [k]aṇ (s)[ū] (pe)rn(e)[w] t(a)kāñ, ente ce śaumo ///

<translation>

- 1 carrying a balance-bar(?) on (his) shoulder in order to bring water, he behaves (as if?) promise(= Skt. *satyaṇkāra* ?) ... ///
- 2 you have indeed led(?) together with enjoyment(?). Araṇemi says, "In your order, I am a standing man ... ///
- 3 Bring (wreaths?) into palace! || There then now, the gardener Araṇemi ///
- 4 ... || In(←with) such a manner ... of his kingship's sage ///
- 5 ... he saw with animals, with his worth ... all divine trees ///
- 6 ... says to (his) wife, "Oh my darling! The day is worthy for me, when a man (sees?) this ///

THT 091v

- 1 + + + takāñ, pokkā(a) .. pākri tākāreñ, ñākcyana ramT, || tane candramukhi lānte ke(r)cc(i)yainne ///
- 2 + (ka)kkā[k](a)rmeṇ sārri warpoṢAṇtS¹³⁸ () e(nepre) + + + [o]m no ñake se araṇemi werpiśkatstse śpaluwentatS, ywa(rcka?) ///
- 3 + + śānmya ram no palsko la(ntyoy, k,se) cetS, krenta śwatsanma enepre tākoyeṇ tuk cwi PAst aiṣṣiye(ṇ) ///
4. [w](e)sk(e)m k,se pi se eñwe ste tsw[ai](ññe) [ta]ne cārkena klāstRA po krentaunasa kekenu ste mā weṢAṇ saswe ///
- 5 cwi krentaunaŚc, paLKAṇ || tumēṇ candra[m]lukhe [w](alo) ṣecakecce asānne śmemane twār Ṣ[P]A araṇemiṇ werpiśkacce cā(rkenta) ///
- 6 amācānTA preKṢAṇ k,se samp eñwe ste po sāmna[s](a oṇṣa)p() PAlkātsi ste || kintarikne || rājavat¹³⁹ yoK, matsi cwim[P,] ///

¹³⁶ *klātsāT* is after Krause (1952 p. 233) 2. sg. subj. V from $\sqrt{\text{kāl}}$ (t)s "bedrohen". However, pres. II does not combine with subj. V but with subj. II, and $\sqrt{\text{kāl}}$ (t)s cannot produce a subj. stem /klāts-ā-/, but /kālts-ā-/. Therefore, I would like to deny Krause's opinion. Schmidt translates it as "hemmen (?)" and the object *warporše* as "Kummer (?)". I would see *klātsāT* as a mistake for pret. 2. pl. /klāt/ from $\sqrt{\text{kāl}}$ "to lead", *warpor* as a verbal noun of $\sqrt{\text{wārp}}$ "to enjoy" and *še* as a postposition "together with". *še* combined after TEB (p. 251) with comitative /-mpā/, but obl. can substitute all secondary cases, in other words, originally, there was no case in a sence of indger. except nom. and gen., i.e. so called case-marker is a postposition or even an adv.

¹³⁷ -ṣṣe is a adj.-suffix modifying nouns like gen.-attribute, and when gen.-suffix -pi for adj. is added, the qualified noun is in gen. form, so I supply gen. -ntse to *rṣāke* (Adams notices no gen. form).

¹³⁸ *warpoṢAṇtS* is a gen. pl. m. of p.p. from $\sqrt{\text{wārp}}$ "to enjoy". Gen. pl. of p.p. was written, when the qualifying noun is gen. pl., e.g. THT 002r3 *tetemoṢAṇtS*, *onolmeṇtS*, "(the death) of born people", or for translation of Skt. gen. pl., but when p.p. became a noun, e.g. THT 588v2 *yukoṢAṇtS*, *kekesoṢAṇtS*, "for conquered and extinguished (people)". Here *sārri* "assembly" is an object of (ka)kkā[k](a)rmeṇ "having called", and semantically "assembly of enjoyed people" is not suitable, so the next of *warpoṢAṇtS* could be the word gen. pl. m. beginning with *e-*, e.g. *eikweṇts* "of (enjoyed) men". Schmidt's (2001 p. 322) "vor (= *enepre*) den Versammlungsteilnehmern" is also acceptable, if *warpu* became a noun. The same is *śpaluwentatS* in the next sentence, if *ywa(rcka)* adv. "midst" follows.

¹³⁹ According to Schmidt (2001 p. 322): BHS *rājapaṭṭa* "a kind of (blue) dye-stuff, indigo (color)" (Edgerton 1953 p. 454), but Skt. /p/ → Toch. /v/ (or /w/) is impossible from the point of view of the Toch. phonology (Skt *ṭṭa* → Toch. /t/ with apocope is possible). Moreover, it is impossible to see the Skt. previous member followed by Toch. I suppose that

<translation>

- 1 ... was for me. Say! They were clear for me, like divine (fortunes?) || There in the palace of the king Candramukha ///
- 2 having called an assembly, the enjoyed ... there now the gardener Araṇemi midst(?) of excellent ... ///
- 3 ... as if he tied up the thought of the queen. What(ever) good foods they had in front of them, that they gave to him. ///
- 4 They say, "Who is this man indeed? Just here he brings wreaths. He is in the state of(← with) all virtues. Not our lord ///
- 5 for his virtues (he) shines. || Then the king Candramukha asks, sitting on lion-seat, and thereon (watching?) the gardener Araṇemi (and wreaths?),
- 6 the minister, "Who is that man? He seems to be (←is to see) more (striking) than(←with) all (other) people. || in the metre of *kintarik* || The hair of that man is kingly(←king-like) color ///

THT 092r (T III Š91.29 & Š32.4, Pencil-number 2327)

- 1 /// *poyknesa e[n]. ///*
- 2 /// *[w]. st[e] || amācānta weskeṃ SA ///*
- 3 /// *[tRA] saswe preKAnne mai no SAsweṃ[t](s)e + + .. ŠA. || + + + + + ara(ṇe)*
- 4 (11 syllables)¹⁴⁰ *(ara)ṇemi werpiṣkatstse candramu(khi lā)[n]t(e) kartte¹⁴¹ ykuwerm(e)ṃ asāṃ ṇor ṣ[a]MA[m] || tumem*
- 5 (19 syllables) *sTā kā wat no ci kka cārkena (kalatsi yātka ||) aṇcalī ṣarne yāmu araṇemi weŠŠAṃ*
- 6 (19 syllables) *[tu]sa tane cārkena KAl[ā](skau || ta)ne candramukhe walo araṇemiṃtsa wa(lke)*

<translation>

- 1 /// with all manner ... ///
- 2 /// protection(?) || The ministers say, " ... ///
- 3 /// ... The lord will ask him, however, lord's ... || ... Ara(ṇemi)
- 4 /// the gardener Araṇemi, having gotten near the king Candramuhki, sits below the throne. || Then
- 5 /// (you a)re, or why (did he order) just you (to bring) the wreaths? || With(←done) hands put together Araṇemi says,
- 6 /// therefore here I bring the wreaths. || There the king Candramukha (saw?) over Araṇemi (long time?)

THT 092v

- 1 (19 syllables) *[ye]rpesa meṇ PAlle[n]m(e) ṣ(eṣṣirku : wnohme)[nt]s[o]¹⁴² ra pont{s} aiṣi*

whole word is Skt. which is made in Toch., i.e. *rāja* with possessive suffix *-vat* "king-possessing" → "king-like" → "kingly".

¹⁴⁰ The number of lost syllables (recto 4–6 and verso 1–5) are counted by Sieg/Siegling (1953 p. 29), presumably on the basis of the verse of the back side, and also the numbers of the lost syllables of recto 1–3 and verso 6 are countable in the photo.

¹⁴¹ *kartte* is for *akartte* "near". From the accent rule, this word is phonologically /ākārte/. The reason why *a-* is omitted is either an avoidance of hiatus or a mistake. *metri causa* is possible, but it is not a verse here. An avoidance of hiatus would be deleted, if *e + a > a* in TEB p. 73 is correct. Then a mistake is possible.

¹⁴² In the photo I can see the remnant of *-o* which is the so-called *o*-mobile for the metre. If *wnolmentso* is really written, it

*amiškana*¹⁴³ *ešne no • še*

2 (16 syllables) (*kamar*)t[a]ññe ñem māšāṃ¹⁴⁴ *ste kākā[tsi]* (|| *KArsto*)[š] w(a)štsi ausu¹⁴⁵ *samP**,
wawākauwa kuke-

3 (ne 12 syllables) *rne* : *yakte*¹⁴⁶ *tapre kektseṃtsa pre(ñca yai)ñmu šaṇ, yke«ne»* : *erkatñene kekmu*
*ra sau«ke»*¹⁴⁷ *ymī-*

4 (ye *MAskeTAR* :) (8 syllables) [*m*]. *lykaškaṃ*¹⁴⁸ *lkān[ta]rne* : *KArpyeṃ šw(ātsi*
*še)[š](m)orsa*¹⁴⁹ [*t*.] + + + + + + *onkolma*

5 (18 syllables) + *yāmŠAṃ mañye[m]ts nū* : *tseṃ u[p](pāl)*. ///

6 /// [*MA*]ntantRA *po[š cwi]* ///

<translation>

1 /// (he is) excelled with (round face like) disk in (shape of) full moon. : He gave all to beeings
(who had) greedy(← displeased) eyes. • One(?)

2 /// the name of supremacy is not worthy to call. || That man, put on worn-out clothes, (and)
splitted heels ...

3 /// ... : Despite(←bringing with) high body, he obtained a little in his own place : Even he comes
(across) anger, (his) way

4 is fortunate(?). : ... they will see him (as) small ... : With eating common food ... female
elephant

5 /// he makes (sevices) of slaves for me. : (Like?) blue lotus ...

6 /// they hurt ... for all your ...

should be *onolments* (3 syllables), and if *ponts* is a scribal error for *pontamts* as is corrected in Sieg/Siegling 1953 p. 30 fn. 3, it is not suitable for the metre (7/7). I suppose that *ponts* is a scribal error for *pont* (obl. sg. m. object of *aīsi* "he gave"), then the metre is in order, and also the context is better to understand. The scribe could make two mistakes in my opinion.

¹⁴³ *amiškana* is adj. pl. f., but only found here. If this adj. is really nom./obl. pl. f., there is no qualified noun. *metri causa* it could be used instead of m. *amiškaṃ* which qualifies *ešne* (dual obl. m.). *ešne* could be loc. *ešnene* (haplology). Adams takes it as "*amiškane*?" (1999 p. 19), but there is no dual form in adj.

¹⁴⁴ *māšāṃ* is *mā ašāṃ* "not worthy". Another possibility is *ñemñm āšāṃ* "name is worthy", but *mm* before *ā* and *āšāṃ* are not attested because of the accent system (*āšāṃ* is possible for /āšāṃ/).

¹⁴⁵ *au* of *ausu* is peculiar in form (cf. Tamai 2011 p. 355). This form is written only here and in THT 089r1. An original form is *o* + long-vowel-sign (toward right like *-ā* of *kā*), but here the long-sign is on the contrary written toward the left like *jā*. Therefore, I suppose that Toch. *au* might be *ō*. The peculiar *akšara* here shows that the writer did not know the orthography and possibly made mistakes ↻.

¹⁴⁶ Schmidt (2001 p. 323): "Trotzdem" which might come from *yak* "dennoch" and demon. pron. neut. *te* "so(?)", which is not attested and difficult to understand, and "..." for (*yai*)*ñmu*. Words with *-ñmu* in THT 001–633 are *šeššanmu* (3 syllables) and *yainmu* (2 syllables; passim), so *yainmu* is suitable for metre and context, when *yakte* "little" qualifies *yainmu* "obtained". Then it is easier to understand.

¹⁴⁷ This word is corrected with *-ke* by the writer, but *sauke* is still not understandable. Schmidt (2001 p. 323): "stolz (?)", Adams (1999 p. 705): "?", and nothing in Thomas (1983 p. 246). One possibility is a mistake for *sakwšše* "fortunate", which was occasionally made by the writer. At first the writer wrote *sau* for *s(k)u* and added *k* with *-e* of *-šše*. It is dangerous to make such a hypothesis, but tentatively I take it because it is suitable for the context.

¹⁴⁸ *lykaškaṃ* is a scribal error for *lykaškeṃ* (adj. obl. sg. m.) "small", which is an apposition of *-ne* "him" of *lkān[ta]r-ne*, whose *[ta]* is a scribal error for *TA*, but on the photo it could be *TA*.

¹⁴⁹ (*še*)[*š*](*m*)*orsa* is completed by Sieg/Siegling (1953 p. 30), but I cannot find the root. Thomas proposes *šešworsa* because of THT 407b3 *šešwormeṃ* from *√su* "to eat". I agree with Thomas' opinion, when *šwātsi* *√su* could be a quasi *figura etymologica* "to eat the eating(= food)".

THT 093r (T III Š79.29, no photo, PK NS 36 & 20 is in bold)

1 (wa)lke pilko šeššamorm[e]m weššann(e)šca nemcek twe [k]_ušattarye nesT¹⁵⁰ taise ksa¹⁵⁰ šotrūna
lk[ā](skau) ///

2 (?šmo)ñña neSAṃ || śle skloK candramukhe walo weššAṃ auspa SAsweñntse araṇemiñ lānte
twe ///

3 mā weššAṃ kca || nano¹⁵¹ candramukhe walo weššAṃ auspa poñ¹⁵² mapi twe nesT¹⁵² | [tan(e)
a](raṇemi walo) [w](a)lk(e)PAIsk(o)nt(asa ša)-

4 ñ aṇMampa k[a] weššAṃ MAkte ñake tākaṃ mā ñi pele ste waike weñtsi • tumem
candramukhem lāntaś (w)eš[Aṃ] (•) oroccu walo se ñiś[¹⁵³] [a](raṇemi su) walo

5 nesau || te keklyaušormem candramukhe walo šecakecce asāñmem ñor klāya araṇemiñ¹⁵³ lānte
paine yāksau PAIwā(mane ○) weššAṃ ñākte-yoK¹⁵³ sas[w]a

6 k_use te takac¹⁵³ || tumem weššAṃ || devadattenne (20/22/10/15) || ket sāmñe šaišše aiwau
poykne(sa) + + + + + [ci] naktsy āñme : kete wat [n]o [l](kā)-

<translation>

1 having watched(←put a view) (Araṇemi) for a long time, says to him, "You are surely a Kṣatriya,
just so (I) see¹⁵³ the characteristic ...

2 ... is (a site?) || With doubt the king Candramukha says, "In fact, you (are) ... of the lord, of the
king Araṇemi ...

3 (he) says nothing. || Again the king Candramukha says, "Exactly you must tell(←say) (who)
really you are ! || There the king Araṇemi, after(←with) long thoughts

4 just in(←together with) himself, "How would it be now? It is not my way(←law) to tell a lie. •
Then he says to the king Candramukha, • "Oh (my) great king! I myself(← this) am the king
Araṇemi."

5 || Having heard it, the king Candramukha fell down from the lion-seat, clasped the feet of the king
Araṇemi (and) says with whine (←whining), "Oh (my) god-like lord!

6 What happened(←was so) to you? || Then he says || in the metre of *devadatta* || To whom the
human world turned with all manners ... wish to ruin you, : or whose

¹⁵⁰ ksa is so-called indefinitum, but here it is not necessary to see an indefiniteness from the context (*nemcek* "surely" in the previous sentence). Schmidt (2001 p. 323): "Derartige Merkmale", but *taisa* is not adj. I think that *taisa ksa* is not two separated words, but one word *taisaksa* like *tusaksa* "just therefore". Both have intensified forms, *taisa-k* and *tusā-k*. If its suffix /-sā/ can be explained, e.g. double perl. or from /sām/ "equal" (from Skt. *sama* ?) etc., so-called indefinitum /ksā/ could be intensive particle /k/ + /sā/. This is just a hypothesis, but it could be supported by the fact that Toch. is an agglutinative language.

¹⁵¹ PK NS 36 & 20 a1: (ta)ne "there". Hereafter, I refer the transliteration of Couvreur (1964 p. 241 ff.)

¹⁵² PK NS 36 & 20 a1: p[o]ks(e)ñ¹⁵² impv. 2. sg. act. from √āks "to proclaim". This root is so-called thematic, and indger. -e could be a thematic vowel. Judging from the examples, the thematic vowel made the previous consonant palatalize with *ä* instead of *e*, especially in 3. sg. or verbal nouns. The impv. of √āks is made from subj. stem without a palatalizing effect of -e. I wonder whether thematics/athematics really existed in Toch. As far as I see, palatal and non-palatal are just an opposition in Toch.

¹⁵³ Schmidt (2001 p. 323): "Merkmale zeigen (sich an dir.)", but the caus. form is *lakāske-* (caus. marker /ä/ before /sk/), and its pres. mid. is not attested. *šotrūna* is pl. nom./obl. If it is a nom. as is in Schmidt, the predicate should be *lkāsnTAr*, but such a form is not attested. *lkānTAr* is possible, if √lāk has pres.V, but attested forms are subjunctive. Therefore, I prefer to take pres. sg. act. *lkāskau*. It is suitable also for the context. Apropos, there is no pl. obl. *šotarñma* (Adams 1999 p. 663) in THT 001–633. If it exists, it should be a scribal error or another word, because /-u/ in pl. is an important characteristic for this word.

THT 093v (PK NS 36 & 20 is in bold, IOL Toch 069 (old No. H 149.240) is in bold italics in THT 93v3 – 94v1)

1 *tsi*¹⁵⁴ *āñme nraišana to(ṃ) LAklenta su ci klāte ñyātsene : k_ise nai [ñ]k(e) [p](i)*¹⁵⁵ *su aknā(tsa śaumo :)* (15 syllables for *pāda* d)

2 *pokseñ nai saswa śarM₁ cwi wāntrentse k_ise ksa allek*¹⁵⁶ *tañ¹⁵⁷ enisate yapoy¹⁵⁸ (:)* *śak ko(ntsa) + + [t/k]e[ñ]i [s/p.]eñi* (8 syllables) (*śau*)-

3 *ly ñi śaśayu : sanam sasweñtse lakau kr_i yneśo*¹⁵⁷ : *tārko(←au) eñKAL₁ + + + .n. + k. lk(ā)[s]TAR₁ ā + + [2 s]w(e)[s](e) [t]s(ainwāṣṣe s)w(ā)-*

4 *SAskau kemtsa tsainwāṣṣai l(ā)ñsa KAlymiñ prutkaskau*¹⁵⁸ : *srukoṢṢAñts a + + + + + āntse yke posTAm yammaR₁ p(ā)[k](e) t(e)ntse ñiś¹⁵⁹ •*

5 *ylaiñākte ram no lare-yok saswe<ṃ> : tallāw ram no śem ñi ypoynse se ñkeK₁ lnaskau śle + + (3) (arañemi walo) weṢṢAñ oroccu walo (tā)kañc(°)*¹⁵⁹

6 *śconīye mā su ksa neSAm ce śaiṣṣene k_ise ñiś maiyyasa cāmpalle śai cem erkatñe kalatsi | tumem weṢṢAñ | aptsara(darśamne) (4x14) |* + + + + +

<translation>

1 wish to show(←make see) the miseries of hells, he led you into distress. : Who was indeed the foolish human being? : (15 syllables for *pāda* d. 1.)

2 Well, oh (my) lord, tell me the reason of your matter! Some other man grabbed your country. : Through ten days ...

3 my lived life. : If I would see really an enemy of the lord, : I will dismiss the suffering ... he would see ... 2. I will make weapon's rain fall(←rain)

4 on the earth, I fulfill (all) directions with weapon's flood. : Of died ... shoulder continually(←step by step). I would take(←make) its part •

5 Like Indra (he is) loving lord : like poor (man) he came in my country. Just now I go out with (suffering? 3.) The king Arañemi says, "Oh (my) great king! It would be

6 your hatred. There is no one in this world, who could bring me the anger with force. || Then he says. || in the metre of *apsaradarśana* || ...

¹⁵⁴ This inf. functions as caus. Cf. TEB I p. 184.

¹⁵⁵ PK NS 36 & 20 a4: *śai*

¹⁵⁶ PK NS 36 & 20 a5: [K](₁). Thomas (1983 p. 247) and Schmidt (2001 p. 325) take *k_ise ksa allek* as interrogative "Wer anders denn ...?" This expression (*k_ise ksa* & *allek*) is only written here. Judging from other examples in THT 001–633 and TEB II p. 185 "Indef. *k_ise pi ksa*", *k_ise ksa* is not interrogative, but an indefinite pronoun "someone". Cases like this can be seen in Skt., cf. Whitney 1879 p. 177 § 507: "The interrogative pronoun, ... it is by various added particles converted to an indefinite meaning: thus, by *ca, cana, cid, api, vā* ... thus, *kās canā* 'any one' ...".

¹⁵⁷ PK NS 36 & 20 b1: (k)[w]r(i y)[n](eś)[n](e)

¹⁵⁸ *prutkaskau* is 1. sg. pres. caus. of $\sqrt{\text{prutk}}$ "to be filled", and there is no subj. in the caus., therefore, pres. is used, though subj. is necessary from the context (*swāSAkau* in previous passage). Judging from *a* before /sk/, the writer is neglected, because /ä/ before /sk/ is an important characteristic for causative.

¹⁵⁹ Couvreur supplements (*a*)kañc ("± distant" Adams 1999 p. 1, equivalent to Skt. *prāntam* "border"), but (*a*)KAñc is written in Lévi 1933 p. 55, U (24) a3. It is problematic depending on whether (*a*)kañc and (*a*)KAñc are the same because of both (*a*)- and the accent. Schmidt translates it as "Schließlich" (2001 p. 325), presumably following Couvreur's. Also, Thomas (1983 p. 248) cites Couvreur's without any comment, but (*a*)kañc does not make any sense here. I would like to complete it as (*tā*)kañc "for you it would be" which is more suitable for the context.

THT 094r (T III Š93.13, Pencil-number 2326, PK NS 36 & 20 is in bold, IOL Toch 069 (old No. H 149.240) is in bold italics

- 1 *sa ptārka s̄conai wroccu wlo [:] (mā ksa neSAṃ)¹⁶⁰ [t]ā kentsa k_{se} nī tañci¹⁶¹ cimpamñe :
karu[n](āṣ)(ṣe) warKṢAltsa rī PAIskoṣṣai yū(kāwa :) akālkaṣṣe retke no were*
2 *te ramT_˘ yāmṣateñ_˘ (: 1) kRA¹⁶²tājñeṣṣi prerī aunarñ RA[s](kr)[e] (arañcne :) [ā]ñmalāṣl[ñ]e
orotse sū nīś klāte ce y[k]e[ne : lkāsk]au ś[ai]ṣṣe [ta]llān[t]o¹⁶³ (o)-*
3 *ś kakamaṢ kleśanmatS^{*} ¹⁶⁴ [:] pudñā(kte)¹⁶⁵ (11 syllables) (2) ... ke ñke nās_˘*
4 *śle witsakai PASt_˘ nkema(R_˘) /// snai mattsi(←mentsi?) (m)[āka] mā[ka] ///*
5 *temeñce ette (ya)lyñene /// candramukhe ///*
6 */// ske || a /// (brā)[hm](a)neṃtS_˘ ///*

<translation>

- 1 with ... dismiss the hatred, oh (my) great king! : There is nobody over the world, who might inhibit my ability. : With the power of the pity I overcame the fortress(← city) of the thought. : The army of the wish, however,
2 was destroyed(← made into odor) in such a way of mine. (: 1) Arrows of *Kṛtājñā* have hit (←met) me violently in the heart. : The big pity brought me into this place. : I see the world (of) misery
3 (which) brought disaster(?) of afflictions. : The Buddha ... (2) I then ...
4 perish with root /// without sorrow(?) very much ///
5 Consequently in going down /// Candramukha ///
6 /// ... || A(raṇemi?) /// of Brahmins ///

THT 094v #45

- 1 + + + + + cce pil[k]. ///
- 2 *śpālmeṃ tsai[ñ](ñe)sa [p]ūta(ntse?) ///*

¹⁶⁰ This is a complement of Schmidt (2001 p. 324 fn. 139) for four syllables. Other suggestions are Thomas 1983 p. 248 *mā su neSAṃ* and Couvereur 1983 p. 245 fn. 54 *jaṃbudvipsai* or *pelaikneṣṣai*. There is no *mā ksa*, but there is *mā su (ksa)* "nobody". Also, here I see no value of *ksa*, but it is used for one syllable in the verse (*metri causa*). *ksa* might be the so-called indefinitum original, and it cannot be used alone, e.g. *k_{se} ksa* or *su ksa*. Therefore, I prefer to take *mā su nta ksa* (THT 099v5) or *mā su neSAṃ* (Thomas 1983 p. 248). I would take the latter, because it is better to take the predicate in the main clause which is correlative with *k_{se}*-clause.

¹⁶¹ *tañci* is *hapax legomenon* and according to Krause (1952 p. 246) this is an optative from $\sqrt{\text{tānk}}$ "to inhibit". If *tañci* is really an opt., it should be *tañśi* (← /tāns-i/ ← /tānk-i/). A similar example is *k_{se} nī cāñśū* in THT 139v5. If *cāñśū* (also *hapax legomenon*) is an opt. of $\sqrt{\text{tānk}}$, it is acceptable because *cāñś-* could be subj. II which apts to pres. II. Judging from inf. *tañksi* of this root, it is subj. I. There is an irregularity in this root but *tañci* could be a scribal error, because *ñś* is a regular phonotactic in Toch.

¹⁶² *kṛtājñeṣṣi* is difficult to understand. Schmidt translates it as "rachsüchtig", presumably based on the context. *kṛtājñe* is a noun, not Skt. adj. *kṛtājñā* "grateful, knowing what is right" (MW p. 302) or "name of a previous incarnation of Śākyamuni" (Edgerton 1953 p. 190). Other possibilities are: a mistake for *kṛtaghna* "ungrateful" (MW p. 302) which is better for the context, *metri causa* without *a-* of *akṛtājñā* 不知恩惠 "not known of benefit" (Nakamura p. 137), or Skt. *kṛta-ajñā* "known of ignorance". In any case, the writer confused noun and adj. of Skt., so I would not dare to translate it.

¹⁶³ -o of [ta]llān[t]o is *metri causa* an *o*-mobile. Next *oś* is written in THT 213 v5, but the meaning is unknown. According to Adams (1999 p. 126) it is a compound *oś-kakāmau* "led astray", but such a compound is impossible. This *oś* could be an adv., e.g. "really" or "indeed", or noun obl. "disaster"(?), if *kakamaṢ* is obl. sg. and an apposition of [ta]llān[t]o qualifying *śaiṣṣe*. Tentatively I take *oś* as a noun.

¹⁶⁴ PK NS 36 & 20 v5: *kleśanmaś_˘*; PK NS 83 r5: *kleśAnmatSA* (Couvereur 1964 p. 243 fn. 37, in another word order). It is confused with gen. pl. and all. pl.

¹⁶⁵ IOL Toch 069 v2: *lkāskau śaiṣṣe tallānto : pū[dñā](kte)*

- 3 (?mā pkā)mai nta brāhmaṇeṇ kautsi [wa] ///
- 4 mukhe walo araṇemiṇ ///
- 5 ŚPA lantuññana yārke[nta] ///
- 6 (a)pāKArtse ltu ṣaṇ yapo¹⁶⁶ ///
- <translation>
- 1 ... view ///
- 2 with excellent jewellery (of) cost ///
- 3 (I do not intend) to kill Brahmins at all. ... ///
- 4 the king Candramukha (?says to the king) Araṇemi ///
- 5 and ... royal honors ///
- 6 he went out apparently from his(←Araṇemi's?) own country. ///

THT 095ar (T III Š64.17 & 18, the line 2 is the end of *Araṇemi-Jātaka* showing its *somodhāna*. Then the new one, *Subhāṣitagaveṣin-Jātaka* begins with the dialogue between Guṇasampada and presumably Jñānasthita as is in *Araṇemi-Jātaka*)

- 1 (e)tre ṣaiM, k_use no sū (rudramukhe brāh)[m](a)ne ṣai soy śano makce ŚPA yaṣṣāteñ, se [ñā] ///
- 2 sā ñake yaśo(dhara ste) k_use no su u[tta]re mñcuṣke [ṣ]ai se ña(k)e [rā]hul[e] st(e) || k_use ///
- 3 te maṇṭ yaknesa /// (ñ)ñ(e) perneśca skaināmane ///
- 4 sāksa yeS, ṣam(ā)[n]i pa + /// [...] yaṭkor po āñmtsa paṣṣaT, te we ///
- 5 ni pañāktentse welyñesa /// [o]m no ñake guṇasampa[d]e ///
- 6 subhāṣitagaveṣi ñem(tsa) /// pi ślaukantse perne ///
- <translation>
- 1 the hero, I was (that). Who was the Brahmin (Rudramukha) who solicited me for (my) son, wife and myself, he (is now) ///
- 2 she is now Yaśodhara. Who was the prince Uttara, he is now Rāhula || Who ///

III. Aranemi in other documents

1) Pāli Aṅguttara-Nikāya (AN) IV pp. 136–139 (Aranemi is called as Araka):
Appakaṃ jīvitaṃ manuṣṣānaṃ "the human life is trifling". For this theme there are some parables, i.e. *ussavabindūpamaṃ* "like a dew drop", *udakabubbulūpamaṃ* "like a bubble", *udake daṇḍarājūpamaṃ* "like a stick-line in the water", *nadipabbateyyūpamaṃ* "like a mountain-born (water) of a river", *khelapiṇḍūpamaṃ* "like a saliva-lump", *maṃsapesūpamaṃ* "like a mass of flesh", *govajjūpamaṃ* "like a cow-killing", and consequently *jīvitaṃ manuṣṣānaṃ parittaṃ ... natthi jātassa amaraṇaṃ* "the lifetime of human beings (is) short ... there is no immortality for a living creature". And the conclusion of this Jātaka: *jhāyatha, mā pamādattha, mā pacchā*

¹⁶⁶ Sieg/Siegling 1953 p. 32: *yapo(ymen)*, Thomas 1983 p. 249: "(syntaktische Zusammenhang) nicht sicher", Schmidt 2001 p. 326 *yapo(yne)*. *pāKArtse* is 4 syllabic word *apāKArtse* (adv., not adj. as in Adams 1999 p. 16) qualifying *ltu* (p.p. of √lāt "to go out" nom. sg.), which could be a doer (*nomen agentis*), and √lāt requires an abl. Then it should be *yapo(ymen)*. Schmidt might have thought that *ṣaṇ* "his own" would be "Candramukha's own", but I suppose it "Araṇemi's own" because of abl. *yapo(ymen)*.

vippaṭṭisārino ahuvaṭṭha! "You must think (deeply), do not be negligent, do not be a repent afterwords!".

2) Aranemi in Skt.:

a. *Avadāna* Anthology from Merv, Turkmenistan (Karashima 2015 p. 169).

I quote the translation:

"As (I was, as a chariot-maker¹⁶⁷, skilled) in the crookedness in wood, defects in wood, so (I am now skilled) in the distortions of the body, defects of the body. Like in the story of Dharmapāla, who did not have any hatred in his mind, when he was killed by his father, (so) was Aranemi (not Aranemi), being the Bodhisatva, ... in detail ... (said:) "Life is, O disciples, short!"

b. SHT 1720 (Wille 1991 p. 143–4) & 1324 + 1331 (Wille 1989 p. 81–2)¹⁶⁸:

According to Wille, the SHT version r1–3 is identified with *Mahāvadānasūtra* 1b.4–5 (Waldschmidt 1956 p. 65), and after the repetition of the monk's speech, Wille complements the text comparing with 阿蘭那經 T.01.682b26 and AN IV 136.26.

Judging from the type of scripts, I suppose that the manuscript was written in Sängim or Murtuq (SHT 1720: T II S 75, from Sängim, but 1324 + 1331: X 60 + X 80, unknown place¹⁶⁹), where Abhidharma was written in Toch. with the same type of *akṣaras*, which is II-1 in my classification (cf. Tamai 2011 pp. 81 f.).

I quote the transcription of Wille (ibid.). The SHT texts (r1–3) are in bold, and round parentheses are complements which are missing in SHT.

(*kā nu yuṣmākaṃ bhikṣavaḥ sambahulānāṃ bhi*)<r1>***kṣūṇām upasthānaśā***(*lāyāṃ saṃniṣaṃṇānāṃ saṃnipatitānāṃ antarākathā v*)***iprakṛtā*** | *kay*(*ā cātha kathayaitarhi saṃniṣaṃṇāḥ saṃnipatitāḥ* |) <r2> ***ihāsmākaṃ bhadanta sambahu***(*lānāṃ bhikṣūṇām upasthānaśālāyāṃ saṃniṣaṃṇānāṃ saṃni*(*patitānāṃ ayaṃ evaṃrūpo 'bhūd antarākathāsa*)<r3>***mudāhārā*** (|) ***alpakaṃ e***(*va jīvitaṃ manuṣyānāṃ*) /// (*p*)***ūrvavad yāvat yāvat kalyāṇacaryāyām iy***(*aṃ asmākaṃ bhadanta sambahulānāṃ* <r4> ***bhikṣūṇām upasthānaś***(*ālāyāṃ saṃniṣaṃṇānāṃ saṃnioati*)***tānām antarākathā viprakṛtā*** | *tayā ca anayā vā* (*bhagavaṃ kathayaitarhi saṃni*)<r5>***saṃṇā saṃnipatitā e***(*va*)***m etad bhikṣavaḥ*** /// *manuṣyānāṃ pūrvavad yāvat kalyāṇacaryāyām* /// <r6> (*aśī*)***tivarṣasahasrāyūṣo manuṣyā*** /// *yām mahad eva sūtram* | *aśītir varṣa*(*sahasrāyūṣo manuṣyāḥ* /// <v1> ***t kauravyo nāma cakravartī cāturantyām v***(*ijetā*) /// (*a*)***dhyāvasitā vā taṃ rājñāḥ kauravyasyā*** /// <v2> (*nya*)***grodharājā babhūva*** | ***supraṭiṣṭhitasya ny***(*agrodharājñāḥ*) ///

¹⁶⁷ This concept is the same as the Tibetan popular etymology (cf. Mvy 3472, Jäschke 1881 p. 439): *rtsibs-kyi* (= Skt. *ara* "spoke") *mu-khyud* (= Skt. *nemi* "rim").

¹⁶⁸ SHT means "Sanskrihandschriften aus Turfan" in Berlin. I got information about these fragments in Ogiwara 2011 from Yao's publication (see next, Aranemi in Tibetan). SHT 1720 is on the left side of 1324 + 1331, for which we should thank Wille who recognized it (1991) after SHT 1324 + 1331 (1989). I quote his transliteration and complement which is based on *Mahāvadānasūtra* (see above). According to Ogiwara, this part corresponds to 阿蘭那經, 阿蘭那經, B-Toch. *Udānāṇikāra* (THT 003a5–b3, see below) and Pāli.

¹⁶⁹ This SHT manuscript is written by the Tocharian in Sängim or Murtuq. SHT 1720 has a *signum* T II S 75 which means "the second Turfan expedition, No. 75 (from) Sängim", but sometimes the found spot is confused, e.g. "M" for Murtuq, but it is sometimes mistaken for Ming-Öi Qizil (M.Q.) or "X" for Kuča (cf. Sieg/Siegling 1953 p. 8). The manuscripts from Sängim or Murtuq are written in a relatively late time compared to M.Q. I would introduce the result of the ¹⁴C-test in order to show a chronological relation in Toch. area: THT 178 from Sängim is written in A.D. 697–773; THT 367 from Murtuq is written in A.D. 737–773 (cf. Tamai 2011 p. 320 and 374).

(brā)hmanamahāśālah .. mātṛāṇi māṇavaśat(asaḥsrāṇi) /// <v3> ti athāranemino brāhma(rājā) /// <v4> manuṣyāṇāṃ pūrvavad yāva(t kalyāṇacaryāyāṃ /// (keśaśma)śrūṇy avatārya kāṣāyāni vastrāṇy ācchā(dya) /// <v5> (ana)gārikam pravrajeyam | athāranemi brā(hmano) /// (katha)yati | yat khalu mā(ṇavāḥ) /// <v6> (p)ūrvavad yāvat kalyāṇacaryāyāṃ /// (kāṣā)yāni vastrāṇy āc(chādya)

The theme is *alpakam eva jīvitaṃ manuṣyāṇāṃ* "the human life is really short" as in Pāli, Tibetan and Chinese (阿離念彌經, 阿蘭那經). "80,000 years old" is depicted in 阿蘭那經 and Tib. (84,000 in 阿離念彌經). Kauravya is depicted in Chin. and Tib. Other contents or elements are added in each texts diachronically and synchronically.

3) Aranemi in Tibetan: Panglung 1981 p. 49. I quote his commentary and translation.

Aranemi: Der brahmanische Lehrer, der seine Schüler in den Apramāṇas unterweist.

"Zu der Zeit, als die Menschen 80,000 Jahre lang lebten, war ein Brahmane namens Aranemi. Er und seine 500 Schüler wurden Asketen. Er lehrte seine Schüler Vergänglichkeit, Liebe, Mitleid und Gleichmut. Ich war damals der Brahmane Aranemi."

The detailed content is available in Yao 2013 pp. 429–431 (in Japanese). According to Yao, this story is not found in Chin., but corresponds to 阿蘭那經 (see below) and Pāli AN (see above), paralleled to 阿離念彌經 (see below) and B-Toch. *Udānālāṇikāra* (Ogiwara 2011, see below). As far as I see, the theme of these stories is "the life is short" (I will argue it later). The Skt. name is depicted in Chin., e.g. Skt. *Kauravya* in 阿蘭那經 as 拘牢婆, in 阿離念彌經 as 拘獵, or Skt. *Supraṭiṣṭhita* in 阿離念彌經 as 須波桓樹, and some parts correspond to Udānavarga 1.16cd, 1.13, 1.14 and 1.15–16ab. Moreover Sunetta, Mūgapakkha, Aranemi, Kuddālaka, Hatthipāla and Jotipāla (Govinda) are depicted in AN, and the first three Brahmins appear in Tibetan, others are not sure, but they presumably appear under different names (cf. Yao ibid. and fn. 30 above).

4) Aranemi in Chinese:

a. 阿離念彌經 (T.03.49c18–50a16 in 六度集經); reduced translation from Chavannes 1962 p. 331–332.

時有長者名阿離念彌。財賄無數。念彌自惟。壽命甚促。無生不死。實非己有。數致災患。不如布施以濟貧乏。世榮雖樂無久存者。不如棄家捐穢濁。執清潔袈裟作沙門。即詣賢衆受沙門戒。凡人見念彌作沙門。數千餘人。聞其聖化皆覺無常。有盛即衰。無存不亡。唯道可貴。皆作沙門。隨其教化。念彌爲諸弟子說經曰。

人命致短。恍惚無常。當棄此身就於後世。無生不死。焉得久長。是故當絕慳貪之心。布施貧乏。捨情攝欲。無犯諸惡。人之處世命流甚迅。人命譬若朝草上露須臾即落。人命如此。焉得久長。人命譬若天雨墮水泡起即滅。命之流疾有甚於泡。人命譬若雷電恍惚。須臾即滅。命之流疾有甚雷電。人命譬若以杖捶水。杖去水合。命之流疾有甚於此。人命譬若熾火上炒少膏著中。須臾焦盡。命之流去疾於少膏。人命譬若織機經縷。稍就減盡。天命日夜耗損若茲。憂多苦重。焉得久長。人命譬若牽牛市屠。牛一遷步。一近死地。人得一日猶牛一步。命之流去又促於此。人命譬若水從山下。晝夜進疾無須臾止。人命過去有疾於此。晝夜趣死。進疾無住。人處世間甚勤苦多憂念。人命難得。以斯之故。當奉正道。守行經戒無得毀傷。布施窮乏。人生於世無不死者。念彌教諸弟子如斯。

En ce temps, il y avait un maître de maison nommé A-li-nien-mi qui possédait des richesses incalculables. (A-li-)nien-mi fit cette réflexion: «La vie est fort courte; il n'est point d'être vivant qui ne meure; ... Tous devinrent çramanas et suivirent ses enseignements. (A-li-)nien-mi expliquait les textes saints à ses disciples en leur disant:

«La vie humaine est fort brève; comme une lueur, elle est impermanente. ... la vie humaine est comparable à la rosée qui se dépose sur les herbes au matin et qui tombe en un instant; ... La vie humaine est comparable aux gouttes de pluie qui tombent dans l'eau; ... La vie humaine est comparable à la lueur de l'éclair qui s'éteint en un instant; ... La vie humaine est comparable à l'acte de fendre l'eau avec un bâton; ... La vie humaine est comparable à un peu de graisse qu'on passe dans une friture faite sur un feu ardent; ... La vie humaine est comparable au fil qui traverse le métier; ... La vie humaine est comparable à un bœuf qu'on traîne à la boucherie: ... La vie humaine est comparable à un torrent qui descend de la montagne et qui jour et nuit se porte en avant avec impétuosité sans jamais s'arrêter; ... La vie humaine étant chose insaisissable, c'est pour cette raison qu'il faut se conformer à la vraie doctrine, observer les défenses prescrites et n'y porter aucune atteinte, faire des libéralités aux pauvres. Des hommes qui naissent dans ce monde il n'y en a aucun qui ne doive mourir.» Tels étaient les enseignements qu'(A-li-)nien-mi donnait à ses disciples.

Main theme is "the life is short" as in Pāli and Skt.

b. 阿蘭那經 (T.01.683c11–684a28 in 中阿含經; the topics are underlined)

復次尊師阿蘭那爲弟子說法。摩訶磨。猶如夜闇以杖投地。或下頭墮地。或上頭墮地。或復臥墮。或墮淨處。或墮不淨處。如是摩訶磨。衆生爲無明所覆。爲愛所繫。或生泥犁。或生畜生。或生餓鬼。或生天上。或生人間。如是摩訶磨。人命如闇杖投地。甚爲難得。至少少味。大苦災患。災患甚多。..... 我於世斷除貪伺心無有諍。見他財物諸生活具。不起貪伺欲令我得。我於貪伺淨除其心。如是瞋恚睡眠調悔。我於世斷疑度惑。於諸善法無有猶豫我於疑惑淨除其心。摩訶磨。汝等於世亦當斷除貪伺心無有諍。見他財物諸生活具。不起貪伺欲令我得。汝於貪伺淨除其心。如是瞋恚睡眠調悔。汝於世斷疑度惑。於諸善法無有猶豫。..... 我心與慈俱遍滿一方成就遊。如是二三四方 四維上下。普周一切心與慈俱無結無怨無恚無諍。極廣甚大無量善修。遍滿一切世間成就遊。如是悲喜心與捨俱。無結無怨無恚無諍。極廣甚大無量善修。遍滿一切世間成就遊。摩訶磨。汝等亦當心與慈俱遍滿一方成就遊。如是二三四方四維上下。普周一切心與慈俱。無結無怨無恚無諍。..... 若尊師阿蘭那爲說梵世法時諸弟子等有不具足奉行法者。彼命終已或生四王天。或生三十三天。或生檢摩天。或生兜瑟哆天。或生化樂天。或生他化樂天。若尊師阿蘭那爲說梵世法時。諸弟子等設有具足奉行法者。修四梵室捨離於欲。彼命終已得生梵天。..... 尊師阿蘭那及諸弟子。學道不虛得大果報。比丘。於意云何。昔時尊師阿蘭那者謂異人耶。莫作斯念。所以者何。比丘當知。即是我也。我於爾時名尊師阿蘭那。我於爾時有無量百千弟子。

The name Aranemi is used as 尊師 "noble teacher" who made admonitions for his disciples, occasionally with parables like the Pāli version. This noble teacher was the former Buddha who had innumerable disciples, which is like *samodhāna* in Jātakas.

c. 悲華經 (Vol. 2, T.03.174b27–181b08; Vol. 3, T.03.181b12–188c08)

Aranemi appeared as 無諍念 "thinking of no struggle" which came presumably from the meaning of BHS *arana* "free from passion" (Egerton 1953 p. 64). Aranemi is represented as 轉輪聖王 "holy king of *Cakravartin*".

我今悉捨以奉施佛及諸聖衆 (T.03.175a25) "Now I give up all things, and offer them to the Buddha and every holy ones"; 轉輪王因布施故 "because of the offering of Cakravartin-king". The offering of gifts is not the main theme of this *sūtra*, but 阿耨多羅三藐三菩提 (T.03.181b6) Skt. *anuttarasamyakṣambodhi* "supreme perfect enlightenment" (Edgerton 1953 p. 27, 582).

5) Aranemi in Iranian languages:

We can see the name of Aranemi in Tumshuqese (cf. Yoshida 2007a, p. 232) and in Sogdian (cf. Yoshida 2007b, p. 59). Moreover, Hansen (1940) discussed the relation between Toch. and the Iranian language, which shows some connections including etymology of Toch. words within Central Asia.

a. Tumshuqese: Emmerick (1979 p. 172) introduces the existence of the Aranemi fragment, which "further confirms that there must have existed close connections with Kucha". This document was published by Bailey (1968 p. 44) as follows:

Tumshuq. H 149 add. 121 r4 | *je aranemi* | and v4 || *karyortaṇe* ||
v4 *karyortaṇe* could be a B-Toch. metre name in THT 350v3 *karyortaṇṇene* "in the metre of *karyortaṇe* (4x12). The word is similar to *karyortau* "merchant" as is mentioned by Bailey and Emmerick, but I cannot understand why "merchant" or the metre name comes here. If we could find more documents relating this fragment, and meanings of other words could be clear, we can understand *karyortaṇe*. I recognize that this word is Toch. because of so-called Fremdzeichen *ka*.

b. Sogdian: Henning (1940 p. 60–62) introduces that Toch. monk translated Saṃjñā-Dharmāḥ Sūtra into Sogd. as follows:

(v22) *šm'r'kh pδkth* "Saṃjñā-Dharmāḥ" (v23) [*?pwst*]/(*k'*) *'γw 'kwcyk myrz/n'tk* "Sūtra(?) the Kuchean Mir-son(?)" (v24) [*. . . .*] *'rkšyt šmny cnn 'kwc'n'y* ". . . .a-rakṣita, the Śramana, from the Kuchean" (v25) [*zβ'k*] *s'r prw sywδy'w zβ'k* "language into the Sogdian language" (v26) [*prw's*]/(*t*)w *d'rt* "has [translated]".

If this is accepted with certainty, *Aranemi-Jātaka* can be translated from Toch. into Sogd., and the Sogd. version could correspond with Toch. because of some words though it shows fragmentary contents and incomplete words, e.g. (citation from Sundermann's translation¹⁷⁰ in cursive):

- <3. Stück> r2 *kläglich*; r4 *schlimme Wunde schlug und verletzte*; r6 *Verschließung und ihm Ziehen*
- <4. Stück> r3 *wegen des Wunsches des Ranges der Buddhas*
- <5. Stück> r3 *Aranemi der König*

6) Aranemi in Uighur:

As I show above, the Uighur version is almost identical with the Toch. version. It is *communis opinio* that the Uighur Buddhist (texts) had some influences from not only Chin., but also from Toch. (cf. Kasai 2006 pp. 32–38; Moriyasu 2007 pp. 19–29, especially p. 28 about

¹⁷⁰ Sundermann 2001 p. 341–347. The folios are too fragmentary to read with certainty, and possibly it includes other narratives as Yoshida informs (1993 p. 136, 6. Stück MIK 4949b Recto 8 *tausend Kron[en]träger*). Therefore, I refer to Sundermann's translation.

Araṇemi-Jātaka). I cannot understand the discussions very well, which are argued until now including the Toch. philology. I hope that we can co-operate with various scholars, as Kasai writes in the case of *Maitrisimit* (2006 p. 38), in order to make progress in their own fields.

7) Aranemi in B-Tocharian (THT 003 r3–v3):

This story is mentioned in the so-called "Udānālāṅkāra-Fragmente" (THT 01–70) whose find spot is mainly Šorčuq (THT 19, 34–40 from MQ, 43 Hoernre). As far as I see, there are three types of scripts, i.e. Š-1 (round), Š-2 (square) and MQ (also THT 44–46, though the signum is Š, confused?). Sieg/Siegling ordered the numbers on the basis of "Udānavarga", so it is not in order from the diachronic and synchronic point of view, i.e. from different find spots, and unfortunately, there are many folios which are not available, especially of the long texts. The concerned manuscript, THT 003 is also missing, therefore, we cannot check the reading including the type of the writer for the sake of accurate understanding. Fortunately, the reading of Sieg/Siegling is relatively correct, so we can trust it, as I do above.

The Aranemi-legend is, according to Ogiwara (2011)¹⁷¹, found in verse No. 90 *pāda b* ~ the end of No. 94. The theme of this folio is "how the life elapses" (THT 03r2 verse 88 *pāda a*) with citation of Anityavarga of Udānavarga and an abstract point of Chin. *Madhyamāgama* (Chavannes 1962) whose content is the Aranemi-legend (阿蘭那經 above). This means that Udānālāṅkāra is an annotation for Udānavarga as is said, and Aranemi-legend could be used for an easy understanding of the teaching of Buddhism within the famous Udānavarga which was popular in various areas in that time.

IV. Conclusion

The name of Araṇemi or Aranemi was available in various areas, but I can see the two different contents and themes, viz. <1> "the life is short" and <2> "an importance of the gift", and also the name could be written differently, viz. Aranemi for <1> and Araṇemi for <2>. I will sum up as follows:

<1> (Aranemi): Pāli, Skt. (Merv, Toch.), Chinese, Tibetan.

<2> (Araṇemi): Tocharian., Uighur, Iranian (Tumshuqese, Sogd.).

¹⁷¹ His supplement for the verse 94 *pāda a* (THT 003v2) is not correct. (7 = 4 x 3) in his note f in p. 241, it is misleading. It should be (7 = 4-3) for the 2nd part of the 21 syllables in *pādas* = 8/7/6, and this can be 3-4 which comes in THT 003r6 (see also his fn. 14 *ibid.*). Nevertheless, he observes "Aranemi and Araṇemi" correctly (his note e *ibid.*), which I will offer my commentary in the conclusion. Apropos, the Toch. metre is very difficult to understand because there was no relation with others which are known, but I will try to offer my opinion: the system is based on the numbers of syllables (cf. Thomas 1983 p. 272–276) which is similar to Skt. (cf. Appendix I in Apte 1924 pp. 1035–1042) or Greek prosody, e.g. hexameter. There was no long-short opposition in Toch., so it is easier to compose, but the problem is the numbers of syllables. A model could be Skt. because the influence from India was so big that the name of the metre is written often in Skt. word, but it could be modified in Toch. In fact, a mixed system, e.g. here 21/21/18/13 in Toch. was made with *prakṛti* (21 syllables) + *dhṛti* (18 syllables) + *atijagatī* (13 syllables), and the arrangement of each *pāda* was also made, i.e. <for 21> Skt. 7/7/7 → Toch. 8/7/6 (= 5-3-4-3-6); <for 18> Skt. 5/6/7, 4/7/7, 11/7, 8/5/5 → Toch. 9/9 (= 4-5-4-5); <for 13> Skt. 6/7, 7/6, 3/10 → Toch. 7/6 (= 4-3-6). This mixed formation occurred in the case of the 21 syllables in one *pāda*, whose cause is obscure, but I suppose (of course not sure) that the three syllables are important as is in India and Greek, and 8/7/6/ was arranged with <8 = 5-3>, <7 = 4-3> and <6 = 3-3>, which looks like one verse, or simply 4 x 21 is too long? Sometime we can see 4-3 → 3-4 (this is the upper case) or 6-5 → 5-6 because of the number of syllables in Toch. words.

De <1>: From a chronological point of view, the Pāli version is original with the hero's name "Araka", and this Jātaka spread over various areas as the teaching of Buddhism, in which the original "Araka" was changed to "Aranemi" with the theme "life is short". In Skt. versions (Merv and B-Toch.) we can see the same theme with the name of "Aranemi".

In the Chin. version, 阿離念彌 and 阿蘭那 are the sound reproductions of Skt. "Aranemi", whose "ne" was represented as 念 *nem^h* and 那 *nā*¹⁷², which are not "ne", because "n" and "ṇ" are distinguished and reproduced in different characters in the Tang dynasty 唐王朝 (Prof. Karashima's suggestion).

無諍念 "thinking of no struggle" in 悲華經 is a semantic translation of BHS *arana* "free from passion" (see above), and the main theme is not "life is short", but 阿耨多羅三藐三菩提 Skt. *anuttarasamyakṣambodhi* (see above).

In the Tibetan version, it is *Rtsibs-kyi mu-khyud* "fellies composing the rib of a wheel" (Jäschke 1881 p. 439) *Ara-nemiḥ* (cf. Mvy 3472), which is translated from Skt. *ara* "spoke" and *nemi* "rim", which could be a popular etymology, but the concept is similar to Merv *Avadāna*.

De <2>: On the contrary, the theme of type <2> in Toch. is "importance of gifts" which could explain the teaching of the first *Dānapāramitā*¹⁷³ of the six *pāramitās* (六波羅密: 布施 *dāna*, 自戒 *śīla*, 忍辱 *kṣānti*, 精進 *vīrya*, 禪定 *dhyāna*, 般若 *prajñā*).

We can see the same theme (轉輪王因布施故) in 悲華經, which could be influenced by the Toch. version.

From the scripts in Uig., *n* and *ṇ* are not distinguished, if it is not written in Brāhmī-script (Prof. Zieme's suggestion), but the Uig. version shows almost the same content as Toch. with some modification which would fit into the Uighur culture.

The Sogdian version is too fragmentary to get the content and there is no script for *ṇ* (cf. Gershevitch 1961 p. 1), but judging from some words, we can guess the same content as Toch.

My hypothesis:

Our Toch. versions show both <1> and <2>. The traditional version could be <1>, and <2> was newly created in Toch. with the well known name "Aranemi" for the sake of the explanation of the difficult teaching of Buddhism, viz. *Dānapāramitā* "perfection of gift". Instead of "Aranemi" the Toch. writer used "Araṇemi" in order to show the Skt. conception with *ṇ* which was not Toch. phoneme, but used only for Skt. words. Such a character was not changed in shape chronologically, though that of Toch. own phoneme showed the palaeographical development. The linguistic and semantic development can be seen not only in Toch., but also in all other languages, as well as in the content. Therefore we should read old documents diachronically and synchronically.

¹⁷² These *nem^h* and *nā* are not modern Chinese 平音 *píng-yīn*, but pronunciations in early middle Chinese reconstructed by Pullyblank (1991 p. 225, 221).

¹⁷³ If there are 18 folios between No. 89 and 91, and also the Uig. version, Mz 223 belongs to the gap, which contains *kṣānti-pāramitā* (cf. fn. 125 above), we can see No. 1 *dāna-pāramitā* and No. 3 *kṣānti-pāramitā* of six *pāramitās*. Then it is possible that *Araṇemi-Jātaka* was compiled for six *pāramitās*. This could mean that Jātaka was used for easy understanding of difficult teachings of Buddhism.

Appendix

The shape of *r* and *rr* in Toch. area (Northern Brāhmī):



The oldest shape: *rr* in THT 273r3 (MQ70.7).



Our Araṇemi-Jātaka (THT 85):

v6 *rr* and

r5 *r*.



THT 3599v a5 *TArre* whose *rr* → *r* like *r* of *wra*



THT 90r3.



OR15007_0154r1 (syllabary) shows *r(c)i* and *r(c)ī* (the upper part of the ligature).

Our *Araṇemi-Jātaka* shows the developed form of *rr* (*r*- + *-r*) which is distinguishable with single *r*, but *rr* was used in ligatures as *r* in order to make /r/ clear. This is a palaeographical development which is useful and important for reading ancient documents. Therefore, we need to see the photos or original folios to get accurate contents which the writer wanted to tell us, viz. communications with ancient writers.

Abbreviation and Symbols

BHS = Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit

Skt. = Sanskrit

Sogd. = Sogdian

Toch. = Tocharian

Uig. = Uighur

abl. = ablative

adj. = adjective

all. = allative

fn. = footnote

f. = feminine

gen. = genitive

indger. = Indo-Germanic

instr. = instrumental

loc. = locative

m. = masculine

nom. = nominative

obl. = oblique (case)

p.p. = past participle

part. = participle

perl. = perlativ

pl. = plural

m. = masculine

nom. = nominative

obl. = oblique (case)

p.p. = past participle

part. = participle

perl. = perlativ

pl. = plural

pres. = present

sg. = singular

subj. = subjunctive

voc. = vocative

phoneme interpretation: //

damaged *akṣara*(s): []

restored *akṣara*(s): ()

correction: (←) or (→)

interlinear insertion: « »

omitted *akṣara*(s): < >

superfluous *akṣara*(s): { }

lost *akṣara*: "+"

illegible *akṣara*: "..."

illegible part of *akṣara*: "..."

traditional diaeresis over *akṣara*: "ä", "ü"

string hole: ○

non-syllabic *u*: "u"

virāma line: "˘"

virāma sign over *akṣara*: "ː"

punctuation: "•" and "ː"

Bibliography and Abbreviations

Akanuma, Ch. 1931: *A Dictionary of Buddhist Proper Names*, repr. in Delhi, 1994.

AN = *Anguttara-Nikāya* part IV, Pali Text Society 1899, repr. 1979, London.

Apte, V.S. 1924: *The practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, Bombay.

Bailey, H.W. 1968: *Saka Documents, Text Volume*, London.

Bartholomae, Ch. 1904: *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*, Strassburg, repr. 1979, Berlin.

Bernhard, F. 1958: *Die Nominalkomposition im Tocharischen*, Göttingen (Dissertation).

Böhtlingk, O. 1879: *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch in kürzerer Fassung*, St. Petersburg, repr. 1991 Kyoto.

Broomhead, J.W. 1962: *Textual Edition of British Hoernle Stein Weber Kuchean Manuscripts*, Cambridge (unpublished Dissertation).

Chavannes, É. 1962: *Cinq Cents Contes et Apologues*, Paris.

Couvreux, W. 1964: "Nieuwe Koetsjische fragmenten van het Aranemijātaka" in: *Orientalia Gaudensia I*, pp. 237–249, Leuven.

Edgerton 1953: *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit, vol. II: Dictionary*, New Haven, repr. in Delhi.

Emmerick, R.E. 1979: "The Historical Importance of the Khotanese Manuscripts" in: *Prolegomena to the Sources on the History of Pre-Islamic Central Asia*, pp. 167–177, ed. J. Harmatta, Budapest.

Filliozat, J. 1948: *Fragments de Texte Koutchéens de Médecine et de Magie*, Paris.

von Gabain, A. 1974: *Alttürkische Grammatik*, Wiesbaden.

Gershevitch, I. 1954: *A Grammar of Manichean Sogdian*, repr. 1961 Oxford.

Gharib, B. 1995: *Sogdian Dictionary*, Tehran.

- Hamilton, J. 1986: *Manuscripts ouïgours du IX^e-X^e siècle de Touen-Houang I II*, Paris.
- Hansen, O. 1940: "Tocharisch-iranische Beziehungen" in: *ZDMG* 94, pp. 139–164.
- Henning, W. B. 1940: *Sogdica* in: *Acta Iranica* 15, Leiden, esp. pp. 59–62.
- Jäschke, H.A. 1881: *A Tibetan-English Dictionary*, repr. 1987 Delhi.
- Karashima, S. and Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya, M.I. 2015: "The *Avadāna* Anthology from Merv, Turkmenistan" in: *The St. Petersburg Sanskrit Fragments (StPSF) Vol. I*, Tokyo.
- Krause, W. 1952: *Westtocharische Grammatik Band I Das Verbum*, Heidelberg.
- Lévi, S. 1933: *Fragments de Textes Koutchéens, Udānavarga, Udānastotra, Udānālamkāra et Karmavibhaṅga*, Paris.
- Mvy = Sakaki, Ry. 1926: *Mahāvīyūtpatti*, Kyoto, repr. Tokyo 1962.
- MW = Monier-Williams, M. 1899: *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, Oxford. repr. 1986 Delhi.
- Mylius, K. 1997: *Wörterbuch Pāli-Deutsch*, Wichtrach (Schweiz).
- Oettinger, N. 1979: *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbums* (Diss.), Nürnberg.
- Panglung, J.L. 1981: *die Erzählstoffe des Mūlasarvastivāda-Vinaya analysiert auf Grund der Tibetischen Übersetzung*, Tokyo.
- Poucha, P. 1955: *Thesaurus Linguae Tocharicae Dialecti A*, Praha.
- Pulleyblank, E.G. 1991: *Lexicon of reconstructed pronunciation in early middle Chinese, late middle Chinese, and Early Mandarin*. Vancouver.
- Schmidt, K.T. 1974: *Die Gebrauchsweisen des Mediums im Tocharischen* (Diss.), Göttingen.
- 2001: "Die westtocharische Version des Araṇami-Jātakas in deutscher Übersetzung" in: *SRS* pp. 299–327.
- Sieg, E. 1952: *Übersetzungen aus dem Tocharischen II*, herausgegeben von W. Thomas, Berlin.
- Sieg/Siegling 1949: *Tocharische Sprachreste Sprache B Udānālamkāra-Fragmente*, Göttingen.
- 1953: *Tocharische Sprachreste Sprache B, Heft 2 Nr. 71–633*, Göttingen.
- SRS = *Silk Road Studies* V, Turnhout, Belgium 2001.
- Stumpf, P. 1990: *Die Erscheinungsformen des Westtocharischen*. (Tocharian and Indo-European Studies vol. 2), Reykjavík.
- Sundermann, W. 2001: "Eine soghdische Version der Araṇwmi-Legende" in: *SRS* pp. 339–347.
- Tamai, T. 2011: *paläographische Untersuchungen zum B-Tocharischen*, Innsbruck.
- TEB = *Tocharisches Elementarbuch von Krause/Thomas Band I Grammatik*, Heideckberg 1960; *Band II Texte und Glossar von Thomas, W.*, Heideckberg 1964.
- Thomas, W. 1983: *Tocharische Sprachreste Sprache B Teil I: Die Texte, Band 1 Fragmente Nr. 1–116 der Berliner Sammlung*, Göttingen.
- 1966: "Tocharische Udānastotras der Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris" in: *Historische Sprachforschung (KZ)* 80. Band, pp. 163–181, Göttingen.
- Waldschmidt, E. 1956: *Das Mahāvadānasūtra Teil II*, Berlin.
- Whitney, W.D. 1879: *Sanskrit Grammar*, Leipzig; repr.: Delhi 1983.
- Wille, K. 1989, 1991: *Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden, Teil 6, 7*, Göttingen.
- ZDMG = *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*
- Zieme, P. 2001: "Araṇemi-Jātaka and ein Sündenbekenntnistext in einer alttürkischen Sammelhandschrift" in: *SRS* pp. 401–433, Planesches XXXVI-LIII.
- 荻原裕敏 (Ogiwara) 2011: 「阿蘭那經に比定された *SHT* 所収梵語断片について」 : 『東京大学言語学論集』 31 pp. 235–268.
- 笠井幸代 (Kasai) 2006: 「トカラ語より翻訳された未比定のウイグル語佛典註釈書」 : 『内陸アジア言語の研究 XXI』 pp. 21–47.
- 季羨林 2010: 「佛教与佛教文化 (一)」 : 『季羨林全集』 16, p. 177 北京.
- 中村 元 (Nakamura) 1981: 『佛教語大辞典』 Tokyo.
- 成松芳子 1975: 「*Karuṇapūṇḍarika* 悲華經所説の生因願について 無量寿經との対照を中心に」 『橋本博士退官記念集』 仏教研究論 (悲華經に於ける轉輪聖王 Araṇemin, pp. 262).
- 森安孝夫 (Moriyasu) 2007: 「西ウイグル仏教のクロノロジー」 : 『佛教學研究』 62/63, (p. 28 『ア

ラネーミ=ジャータカ』).

八尾 史 (Yao) 2013: 『根本説一切有部律藥事』 Tokyo.

吉田 豊 1993: 「ソグド語仏典解説補遺」: 『内陸アジア言語の研究 VIII』 pp. 135–138.

---- (Yoshida) 2007a: 「イラン語圏の仏教信仰とイラン語仏典」: 『原典』 pp. 231–232.

---- (Yoshida) 2007b: 「トルファン学研究所所蔵のソグド語仏典と「菩薩」を意味するソグド語語彙の形式の来源について」: 『佛教學研究』 62/63.